



## STAFF REPORT

TO: Clark County Planning Commission

FROM: Oliver Orjiako, Director<sup>OO</sup>

PREPARED BY: Jenna Kay, Planner II

DATE: August 20, 2020

SUBJECT: **CPZ2019-00030 Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review with proposed amendments to the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035, Chapters 40.440, 40.450 and 40.460 Clark County Code, and the Shoreline Designation Map**

---

### PROPOSED ACTION

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). This is a proposal to review and, if necessary, amend the Clark County Shoreline Master Program in the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035, Shoreline Master Program Chapter 13, Appendices B and H; Chapters 40.440, 40.450, and 40.460 Clark County Code; and the Shoreline Designation Map.

### BACKGROUND

The Shoreline Management Act (SMA) was passed by the legislature in 1971, and adopted by voters in 1972, to protect shoreline resources. The SMA provides an overarching framework of goals and policies which emphasize water dependent uses, environmental protection, and public access. Implementation of the SMA is through local Shoreline Master Programs (SMP), developed and adopted locally, approved and adopted by the state Department of Ecology (Ecology).

Clark County adopted its first SMP in 1974 and updated its SMP in July 2012. The updated SMP was approved by Ecology in August 2012 and took effect in September 2012. SMP policies are included in Chapter 13 of the comprehensive plan. SMP regulations are included in Chapter 40.460 Clark County Code. There is also an SMP map.

The SMA requires each SMP be reviewed and revised, if needed, on an eight-year schedule established by the Legislature. (RCW 90.58.080(4)). The review ensures the SMP stays current with changes in laws and rules, remains consistent with other Clark County plans and regulations, and is responsive to changed circumstances, new information, and improved data.

Ecology provides a Periodic Review checklist which summarizes amendments to state law, rules and applicable updated guidance that may trigger the need for local SMP amendments during periodic reviews. Staff followed the review procedures outlined in WAC 173-26-090(3)(b), using the checklist to document our SMP review considerations and to determine if local amendments are needed to maintain compliance.

The county collected informal feedback in fall 2019 through community outreach activities and developed a draft proposal that was published for a 30-day public comment period in early 2020. The proposal and comments received are provided for your review and consideration.

## SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

The proposal includes amendments to three Clark County documents: 1) Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035, 2) Clark County Code, and 3) the Shoreline Designation Map.

1. Proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan would update the introductory/background text of the Shoreline Master Program Chapter 13, correct scrivener errors, add the Shoreline Designation Map to the comprehensive plan's Appendix B – Figures, update the comprehensive plan legislative history in Appendix H and update the Comprehensive Plan Introduction Section on Integration with other plans.
2. Proposed changes to Clark County Code would revise code text related to the following topics: critical areas, floating homes and on-water residences, freshwater docks, aquaculture, public boat ramps, shift in the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) due to restoration, administrative authority and responsibility, location of the shoreline map, and scrivener errors.
3. Proposed changes to the Shoreline Designation 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 the City of Washougal eastward to Skamania County; correct the shoreline jurisdiction boundary near Lacamas Lake; remove some wetlands near Shanghai Creek that are outside of 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, and update the shoreline map to incorporate current Dept. of Natural Resources water feature layer.

Exhibit 1 provides a complete copy of the proposed text and map amendments. Exhibit 2 is a summary table with a brief description of each proposed amendment. Exhibit 3 provides a set of maps that are a close-up version of the proposed new map in Exhibit 1.

## ADDITIONAL DETAILS ON PROPOSED MAP CHANGES

**Parcel Numbers:** 193 parcels intersect with the proposed shoreline map changes. Exhibit 4 provides a list of all these parcels.

**Location:** The map changes are spread throughout unincorporated Clark County. Exhibit 4 includes the address or location description of each parcel intersecting the map changes. A map highlighting the areas of proposed change is provided in Exhibit 1.

**Area:** Approximately 723 acres are included in the proposed map changes. Approximately 413 acres are proposed to be removed from the shoreline map. Approximately 143 acres are proposed to be added to the shoreline map. Approximately 167 acres are proposed to change shoreline designations on the map.

**Owner(s):** Exhibit 4 includes the owner for each parcel that intersects with the proposed map changes.

**Existing Shoreline Designation:**

Exhibit 2 provides a summary of designation changes for each proposed map change. For the map areas proposed to change, approximately 143 acres currently have no shoreline designation, 126 acres have an aquatic designation, 0.02 acres have a natural designation, 88 acres have a rural conservancy residential designation, 351 acres have a rural conservancy resource designation, and 16 acres have an urban conservancy designation.

**Proposed Shoreline Designation:**

Exhibit 2 provides a summary of designation changes for each proposed map change. For the map areas proposed to change, approximately 413 acres will have no shoreline designation, 87 acres will have an aquatic designation, 0.01 acres will have a natural designation, 0.27 acres will have a rural conservancy residential designation, 202 acres will have a rural conservancy resource designation, 20 acres

will have an urban conservancy designation, .62 acres will have a medium intensity designation.

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED**

Three batches of comments are included in the meeting materials:

1. Written comments received during early stages of the project, from its launch on August 14, 2019 until January 28, 2020, before the start of the 30-day comment period: comments include testimony at the September 3, 2019 County Council hearing on the Public Participation Plan, emailed comments, online open house comment forms, and in-person open house comment forms.
2. Written comments received during the 30-day public comment period, January 28, 2020 - February 27, 2020: comments were received by email and U.S. Postal Service.
3. Written testimony received between Feb. 28, 2020 and the Planning Commission hearing on August 20, 2020. (Note: Comments received up until July 20, 2020 have been compiled at the writing of this report. Additional comments received before the August 20, 2020 Planning Commission hearing will be forwarded to Planning Commission members and posted on the Planning Commission and project websites as they are received.)

Copies of comments received and a comment summary for the 30-day comment period are provided in Exhibits 5 and 6.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC PROCESS**

The SMA and SMP guidelines (RCW 90.58.130, WAC 173-26-090 and 173-26-104) require that local governments make all reasonable efforts to inform, fully involve, and encourage participation of all interested persons and private entities, tribes, and agencies of the federal, state or local government having interests and responsibilities relating to shorelines of the state and the local master program. Local governments may follow the public participation procedures under either the standard local process outlined in WAC 173-26-100, or the optional joint review process outlined in WAC 173-26-104. A Public Participation Plan was prepared as a guide to encourage public participation through the SMP update process. This was adopted by Clark County Council on September 3, 2019. (Resolution 2019-09-10). The county elected to pursue the joint review process. (WAC 173-26-104). Key public process activities and dates are noted below.

Item	Date of Event or Publication
<b>2019</b>	
Coordination and communication with Dept. of Ecology and other Clark County jurisdictions	Ongoing
Project Website – Initial set-up	Jul 31
Work Session – Clark County Council on the proposed Public Participation Plan	Aug 14
Notice for Public Participation Plan Hearing – Legal notice posted in The Columbian, project website, and sent to project email list and neighborhood association leaders. Copies of notices and distribution lists are included in hearing materials.	Aug 19
Hearing on Public Participation Plan – Clark County Council	Sep 3
Meeting – Development & Engineering Advisory Board project briefing	Sep 5
Work Session – Planning Commission project briefing	Sep 5
Notice for September open house - Meeting notice published in The Columbian and Reflector, press release published on Sep 16, and email notification sent to project	Sep 24

email list (Sep 13 and 24) and neighborhood association leaders (Sep 12). Copies of notices and distribution lists are included in hearing materials.	
Meeting – Parks Advisory Board project briefing	Sep 13
Open Houses – Project Initiation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dollar’s Corner Fire Station</li> <li>• Online</li> </ul>	Sep 25 Sep 23 – Oct 7
Work Session – Planning Commission SMP background	Oct 17
Notice for November open houses - Mailer sent to shoreline property owners and residents near to proposed map changes (Nov 4), press released published (Oct 30), meeting noticed published in The Columbian (Nov 4) and the Reflector (Nov 6), email notification sent to project email list (Oct 31 and Nov 12) and neighborhood association leaders (Oct 31), information posted to project website. Copies of notices and distribution lists are included in hearing materials.	Oct 30 - Nov 12
Open Houses – Project Update and Draft Proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ridgefield Administrative &amp; Civic Center, Nov. 14</li> <li>• Frontier Middle School, Nov. 18</li> <li>• Online</li> </ul>	Nov 14 Nov 18 Nov 13 – Dec 1

<b>2020</b>	
Coordination and communication with Dept. of Ecology and other Clark County jurisdictions	Ongoing
Meeting – Clean Water Commission project briefing	Jan 8
Dept. of Commerce – 60 Day Notice submitted	Jan 21
Notice for 30-day public comment period: Mailer to Shoreline Property owners and residents near to proposed map changes (Jan 24), notice published in The Columbian (Jan 28) and The Reflector (Jan 29), email notification sent to project email list (Jan 28) and neighborhood association leaders (Jan 28), information posted to project website. Copies of notices and distribution lists are included in hearing materials.	Jan 24 – 29
Notice for SEPA DNS: published in The Columbian (Jan 28) and The Reflector (Jan 29), emailed to SEPA distribution list, mailer sent to shoreline property renters and owners near to proposed map changes (same mailer as 30-day comment period notice). Copies of notices and distribution lists are included in hearing materials.	Jan 28 – 29
Email follow-up with Parks Advisory Board based on Sep. discussion	Jan 28
30-day Public Comment Period and SEPA Public Comment Period	Jan 28 – Feb 27
Meeting – Development & Engineering Advisory Board project update	Feb 6
Project update memo submitted to Clark County Council	May 14
Meeting – Development & Engineering Advisory Board project update	Jul 9
Notice for Planning Commission Public Hearing: Mailer to shoreline property owners and residents near proposed map changes (Jul 29), notice published in The Columbian (Aug 5), email notification sent to project email list (July 28 and Aug 5) and neighborhood association leaders (Jul 27 and Aug 5). Copies of notices and distribution lists are included in hearing materials.	Jul 27 – Aug 5

Work Session – Planning Commission briefing for hearing, review of proposal and comments received to date	Aug 6
Hearing – Planning Commission. This hearing is considered the joint local/state Dept. of Ecology public hearing to consider the draft proposal.	Aug 20

**APPLICABLE CRITERIA, EVALUATION, AND FINDINGS**

**The Plan Amendment Procedures in CCC 40.560.010(A)(3) states the SMP will be reviewed in accordance with the goals, policies and regulations of the SMP, consistent with the SMA and the state shoreline guidelines in Chapter 173-26 WAC, and with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).**

WAC 173-26-090, 173-26-104 and 173-26-201 describe the periodic review public involvement and approval procedures, optional joint review process for amending shoreline master programs, and the process to prepare and amend shoreline master programs, respectively.

After the county’s final decision is rendered, Ecology must ultimately approve the amendments to the SMP per RCW 90.58.090 of the Shoreline Management Act (SMA). WAC 173-26-201(1)(c) states that master program amendments may be approved by the department (Ecology) provided certain conditions are met. Those conditions and the associated findings are included below:

**Criterion A: WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(i): The proposed amendments will not foster uncoordinated and piecemeal development of the state’s shorelines**

*Shoreline Management Act (SMA)*

Staff reviewed the proposed amendments, in Exhibit 1, for consistency with the section of RCW 90.58.020 that addresses uncoordinated and piecemeal development of the state's shorelines as follows:

The legislature finds that the shorelines of the state are among the most valuable and fragile of its natural resources and that there is great concern throughout the state relating to their utilization, protection, restoration, and preservation. In addition it finds that ever increasing pressures of additional uses are being placed on the shorelines necessitating increased coordination in the management and development of the shorelines of the state. The legislature further finds that much of the shorelines of the state and the uplands adjacent thereto are in private ownership; that unrestricted construction on the privately owned or publicly owned shorelines of the state is not in the best public interest; and therefore, coordinated planning is necessary in order to protect the public interest associated with the shorelines of the state while, at the same time, recognizing and protecting private property rights consistent with the public interest. There is, therefore, a clear and urgent demand for a planned, rational, and concerted effort, jointly performed by federal, state, and local governments, to prevent the inherent harm in an uncoordinated and piecemeal development of the state's shorelines. (RCW 90.58.020)

*Finding:* The proposed amendments do not significantly change the utilization, protection, restoration and preservation of shorelines; foster unrestricted construction on privately owned or publicly owned shorelines of the state; or, reduce coordination in the management and development of the shorelines of the state.

*Conclusion:* The proposal meets criterion A.

**Criterion B: WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(ii): The amendments are consistent with all applicable policies and standards of the act.**

Staff reviewed the proposed amendments, Exhibit 1, for consistency with the policy statements of RCW 90.58.020, WAC 173-26-176 and WAC 173-26-181.

*Shoreline Management Act (SMA)*

There are three main policy goals of the SMA as derived from the policy statements of RCW 90.58.020: 1) fostering reasonable and appropriate uses, 2) protecting public health and the environment, and 3) public access.

1. Reasonable and appropriate uses: It is the policy of the state to provide for the management of the shorelines of the state by planning for and fostering all reasonable and appropriate uses. This policy is designed to insure the development of these shorelines in a manner which, while allowing for limited reduction of rights of the public in the navigable waters, will promote and enhance the public interest. (RCW 90.58.020).
2. Environmental protection: This policy contemplates protecting against adverse effects to the public health, the land and its vegetation and wildlife, and the waters of the state and their aquatic life, while protecting generally public rights of navigation and corollary rights incidental thereto. (RCW 90.58.020).
3. Public access: In the implementation of this policy the public's opportunity to enjoy the physical and aesthetic qualities of natural shorelines of the state shall be preserved to the greatest extent feasible consistent with the overall best interest of the state and the people generally. (RCW 90.58.020).

#### *Washington Administrative Code (WAC)*

The SMA policy goals in 90.58.020 RCW are consistent with policy goals in the SMA guidelines in WAC 173-26-176 and WAC 173-26-181.

WAC 173-26-176: The policy goals outlined in WAC 173-26-176(3) include:

- (a) The utilization of shorelines for economically productive uses that are particularly dependent on shoreline location or use.
- (b) The utilization of shorelines and waters they encompass for public access and recreation.
- (c) Protection and restoration of the ecological functions of shoreline natural resources.
- (d) Protection of the public right of navigation and corollary uses of waters of the state.
- (e) The protection and restoration of buildings and sites having historic, cultural and educational value.
- (f) Planning for public facilities and utilities correlated with other shoreline uses.
- (g) Prevention and minimization of flood damages.
- (h) Recognizing and protecting private property rights.
- (i) Preferential accommodation of single-family uses.
- (j) Coordination of shoreline management with other relevant local, state, and federal programs.

WAC 173-26-181: "Shorelines of statewide significance" means a select category of shorelines of the state, defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(f), where special policies apply. Shorelines of statewide significance are those lakes, whether natural, artificial, or a combination thereof, with a surface acreage of one thousand (1,000) acres or more, measured at the ordinary high water mark, and their associated shorelands; and those natural rivers or segments thereof, downstream of a point where the mean annual flow is measured at one thousand (1,000) cubic feet per second or more, and their associated shorelands. Special policy goals of the SMA and guidelines for shorelines of statewide significance shall give preference to uses in the following order of the preference which:

- (1) Recognize and protect the statewide interest over local interest;
- (2) Preserve the natural character of the shoreline;
- (3) Result in long term over short term benefit;
- (4) Protect the resources and ecology of the shoreline;
- (5) Increase public access to publicly owned areas of the shorelines;

(6) Increase recreational opportunities for the public in the shoreline;

(7) Provide for any other element as defined in RCW [90.58.100](#) deemed appropriate or necessary.

*Finding:* The proposal includes amending CCC Sections 40.440.010, 40.450.030, 40.450.040, 40.460.530 to update critical areas regulations. This change is consistent with the environmental protection policies of RCW 90.58.020, WAC 173-26-176, and WAC 173-26-181.

*Finding:* The proposal includes amending CCC 40.460.250(B)(7) and 40.460.630(K) to clarify code language for floating homes and on-water residences. This change is consistent with the private property rights, single-family use, and coordination of shoreline management with other relevant local, state, and federal program policies of RCW 90.58.020, WAC 173-26-176, and WAC 173-26-181.

*Finding:* The proposal includes amending CCC 40.460.230(B)(8) to incorporate the updated threshold amount for freshwater docks. This change is consistent with the public access and recreation, private property rights, and single-family uses policies of RCW 90.58.020, WAC 173-26-176, and WAC 173-26-181.

*Finding:* The proposal includes amending CCC 40.460.630(B)(13) to add reference to a new aquaculture law. This change is consistent with the environmental protection policies of RCW 90.58.020, WAC 173-26-176, and WAC 173-26-181.

*Finding:* The proposal includes amending CCC 40.460.630(J)(5) to incorporate clarifying language in the recreational uses section to allow boat ramps within a floodway. This change is consistent with the public access and recreation policies of RCW 90.58.020, WAC 173-26-176, and WAC 173-26-181.

*Finding:* The proposal includes amending CCC 40.460.220(A)(3) and 40.460.510(K) to incorporate clarifying language regarding the relief procedures for instances in which a shoreline restoration project within an urban growth area creates a shift in the Ordinary High Water Mark. This change is consistent with the environmental protection and private property rights policies of RCW 90.58.020, WAC 173-26-176, and WAC 173-26-181.

*Finding:* The proposal includes amending CCC 40.460.710(A)(2) and (5) update administrative procedures to clarify permit filing procedures, revise the makeup of the Shoreline Management Review Committee, and address concurrent Type III land use action procedures. The proposal also includes amending CCC 40.460.210, 40.460.430, and 40.460.440 to clarify the location of the shoreline map. These administrative changes are consistent with the coordination of shoreline management with other relevant local, state, and federal programs policies of RCW 90.58.020, WAC 173-26-176, and WAC 173-26-181.

*Finding:* The proposal includes amending the shoreline designation map to incorporate current flood maps. This change is consistent with the environmental protection and prevention and minimization of flood damages policies of RCW 90.58.020, WAC 173-26-176, and WAC 173-26-181.

*Finding:* The proposal includes amending the shoreline designation map to remove areas from the shoreline map, add areas to the shoreline map, and change the designation of areas on the shoreline map. These changes are consistent with RCW 90.58.02, as it states: "Shorelines and shorelands of the state shall be appropriately classified and these classifications shall be revised when circumstances warrant regardless of whether the change in circumstances occurs through man-made causes or natural causes."

*Finding:* The proposal includes amending the shoreline designation map to refine the shoreline map near the Columbia and Lewis River confluence. This change is consistent with the environmental protection policies and coordination of shoreline management with other relevant local, state, and federal programs policies of RCW 90.58.020, WAC 173-26-176, and WAC 173-26-181.

*Finding:* No aspect of the proposal is inconsistent with the policies of RCW 90.58.020, WAC 173-26-176, and WAC 173-26-181.

*Conclusion:* The proposal meets Criterion B.

**Criterion C: WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(iii): All procedural rule requirements for public notice and consultation have been satisfied**

Public notice and consultation rules are included in WAC 173-26-090(b)(3)(a) and 173-26-104, and Chapter 40.510 Clark County Code. Chapter 40.570 Clark County Code covers the county SEPA policies and procedures of Chapters 43.21C RCW and 197-11 WAC.

*Finding:* The public process described above in this report meets the procedural rule requirements for public notice and consultation in WAC 173-26-090, 173-26-104, and Chapter 40.510 Clark County Code.

*Finding:* The SEPA Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) for the proposed non-project action and associated noticing are consistent with the rules and procedures of Chapters 40.570 Clark County Code and 197-11 WAC, WAC 173-26-104, and Chapter 43.21C RCW.

*Conclusion:* The proposal meets criterion C.

**Criterion D: WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(iv): Master program guidelines analytical requirements and substantive standards have been satisfied, where they reasonably apply to the amendment. All master program amendments must demonstrate that the amendment will not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions.**

The proposed amendments were reviewed for consistency with applicable guidelines and standards in WAC 173-26, Part III. As part of this review, the standards in WAC 173-26-231 were considered to assess the amendment's impact on no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.

*Finding:* Research was additionally conducted on each component of the proposed amendments in Exhibit 1 to identify applicable sections of the act, related laws and guidelines. Exhibit 2 includes references for each part of the amendments and explains the reason for the proposed change and its relationship to relevant statutes. Based on the research conducted, staff finds the proposed amendments are consistent with applicable substantive standards.

*Finding:* The proposed amendments do not alter policies or regulations that guide the no net loss standard in the county's shorelines.

*Conclusion:* The proposal meets criterion D.

**NEXT STEPS**

Ecology will review the Planning Commission's recommendation, public comments received during the 30-day public comment period on this proposal, and any testimony provided for or at the Planning Commission hearing.

Ecology will then provide an initial determination of whether or not the proposal is consistent with the policy of RCW 90.58.020 and applicable guidelines.

Clark County Council will hold a hearing to discuss the proposal and vote on an adopting ordinance.

Subsequent review will be completed by Ecology and the ordinance will go into effect 14-days after Ecology approves the amendment.

**RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of **APPROVAL** of the proposed action to the Clark County Council.

**RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY**

The following lists the applicable criteria and summarizes the findings of the staff report. The Planning Commission findings will be added to the table after public deliberation at the Planning Commission hearing scheduled for this application.

<b>COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA</b>		
<b>Criteria Met?</b>		
	<b>Staff Report Findings</b>	<b>Planning Commission Findings</b>
Criteria for Proposed Changes		
<i>Criterion A: WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(i): The proposed amendment will not foster uncoordinated and piecemeal development of the state's shorelines</i>	Yes	
<i>Criterion B: WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(ii): The amendment is consistent with all applicable policies and standards of the act.</i>	Yes	
<i>Criterion C: WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(iii): All procedural rule requirements for public notice and consultation have been satisfied</i>	Yes	
<i>Criterion D: WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(iv): Master program guidelines analytical requirements and substantive standards have been satisfied, where they reasonably apply to the amendment. All master program amendments must demonstrate that the amendment will not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions.</i>	Yes	
Recommendation: Approval		

**ATTACHMENTS**

*Proposal*

Exhibit 1: Proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, Clark County Code, and shoreline maps

Exhibit 2: Summary table of proposed changes

Exhibit 3: Proposed new shoreline designation mapbook (close-up version of proposed new map in Exhibit 1)

Exhibit 4: List of parcels intersecting proposed map changes

*Supporting Documents*

Exhibit 5: Comments received Aug 1, 2019 through July 20, 2020. (Comments received between July 20, 2020 and the August 20, 2020 Planning Commission Hearing will be forwarded to Planning Commission members and posted on the Planning Commission website as they are received.)

Exhibit 6: Summary of comments received during 30-day comment period

Exhibit 7: SEPA Determination of non-significance and associated documents

Exhibit 8: Department of Ecology periodic review checklist

Exhibit 9: Critical areas ordinance reference sheet

Exhibit 10: Memo on map amendment near Columbia and Lewis River confluence

- Exhibit 11: Wetland delineation report for site near Columbia and Lewis River confluence
- Exhibit 12: OHWM determination report for site near Columbia and Lewis River confluence
- Exhibit 13: Memo on map amendment near Shanghai Creek
- Exhibit 14: Current Shoreline Designation Map for reference
- Exhibit 15: Council Work Session documents, Aug. 14, 2019
- Exhibit 16: Council Public Participation Plan Hearing documents, Sep. 3, 2019
- Exhibit 17: Planning Commission Work Session documents, Sep. 5, 2019
- Exhibit 18: Open house documents, Sep. 25, 2019
- Exhibit 19: Planning Commission Work Session documents, Oct. 17, 2019
- Exhibit 20: Open house documents, Nov. - Dec., 2019
- Exhibit 21: Outreach presentations and materials
- Exhibit 22: 30-day public comment materials, Jan. 28 - Feb.27, 2020
- Exhibit 23: Council update documents, May 14, 2020
- Exhibit 24: Planning Commission Hearing additional supporting documents, Aug. 20, 2020