

Rec'd 9/17/19

cc'd: Council
Orjiako
Wiser

No mention of NRCS
Soils manual



-----Department & Programs-----

[GIS Home](#)

[SIGN IN](#)

Land Records

- Property Info Center
- GIS MapsOnline
- Subdivision Browser
- Quarter Sections
- Auditor Records
- Parcel Alteration Forms

Metadata Information Browser

Search by layer name, keywords or display layers grouped alphabetically.

Layer Name: Layer Keyword(s): Attribute Keyword(s):

Demographics

- Socioeconomic Data
- Census 2010 Profiles

limit results: Data Types:

10
Newest
Layers

GIS Programs

- Index of Atlas Maps
- GIS Metadata
- GIS Training
- Annexation Tracker

limit results: Layer Name Beginning with:

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

Storefront

- Digital Data Applications
- Publications
- Printed Maps
- Custom Maps
- Photography
- Developer's Packet

Layer Name: Layer dbsID #:

Overview Summary

Reports

- Vacant Lands

Title:	GMA Landuse
Layer Name:	Landuse
Status:	Active
Library:	clark
Schema:	
Dataset:	
Description:	Landuse polygons created for 1994 GMA Depicts land uses within Clark County as determined by the Planning Department. It is a combination of the Assessors Landuse (Primary Property Type) and the mapping departments Photo Interpretation.
History:	Assessor's PT1 code was aggregated into approximately 25 land use categories. Parcels > 1 acre were classified using photo-interpretation. Vancouver and Clark County Planning also used limited field surveys to update the database.
Other Links:	
Data Type:	ShapeFiles
Derived From:	Landuse - Arc/Info Coverages
Intended Use:	Growth Management and Land Use Planning The Photo Interpretation coverage is from 1:24000 Aerial Photos, this is makes the product unsuitable for display with the parcels coverage.
Intended Scale:	24,000
Metadata Restrictions:	No
Data Restrictions:	None
Maintenance:	Not Maintained
Keywords:	landuse gma growth management
Other Data Types:	Arc/Info Coverages

Contacts

- Staff List
- Office Location

Technical & Source Data

Documented:	12-May-93
Image Reference:	No
Source Title:	
Source Projection:	
Source Description:	Assessor's database on the HP3000 as corrected from limited area field surveys by the City of Vancouver, Clark County Planning and photo- interpretation.
Source Date:	12-May-93
Source Organization:	
Completion Date:	12-May-93
Source Scale:	4,800
Source Contact:	

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING BROAD LAND USE AREAS

A Part to the Framework Plan for
Clark County Comprehensive Land Use Plan

July 22, 1977

Woodland Suitability

The soils in Clark County have been placed in Woodland Suitability groups on the basis of their suitability for trees. The suitability groupings are explained in detail in the Soil survey of Clark County. For purposes of analysis in the Clark County Comprehensive Plan, only those soils with the highest potential productivity were considered. The primary basis of the suitability groupings is the forest site index. The site index is based on the height that dominator co-dominant tree species (in Clark County Douglas Fir is the base) will attain at 100 years of age. Simplified the suitability ratings are:

1. Very high productivity
2. High productivity
3. Medium productivity
4. Low productivity
5. Very low productivity

The ratings 1 and 5 are not found in Clark County. Additionally, not all soils are rated in the County. This is because some soils are too variable to rate or too poor to class according to timber productivity.

For the Comprehensive Plan, the ratings 2, 3 and 4 and "not rated" were mapped. In the alternative land use maps only those soils with a "2" rating were considered.

Soils are an important factor in timber productivity, but they are not the only characteristics considered in forest suitability. Along with soils, rainfall, elevation and cultural factors are considered.

In the areas where the annual precipitation is 70 inches* or greater and where the elevation is 800 feet* m.s. or greater, the area was generally classified for forest conservation. Where soil series occurred with equal forest suitability and agriculture, suitability, forest took precedence on those areas above 800 feet and in areas of 70 inches or greater precipitation and in those areas of less than the best agricultural ratings, that is, if prime agriculture and prime timberland occurred agriculture would be classified.

The following are the soil series with prime timberland characteristics.

Forest Site Index 2

*Cinebar, 3-8 percent (CnB)

Cinebar, 8-70 percent (CnD, CnE, CnG, CnE, CrG)

**Hillsboro silt, 0-15 percent (HoA, HoB, HoC) - *See below -
class as ag.*

*70 inches and 800 feet criteria from Soil Conservation Service of Clark County

Odne, 0-5 percent (OdB)

Olequa, 3-60 percent (OeD, OeE, OeF)



*Where this series occurs under 800 feet or in areas with less than 70 inches of precipitation classify as agriculture.

**Where this series occurs agriculture suitability is high classify as agriculture.

Agricultural Suitability Ratings

Agricultural suitability ratings were developed by the Soil Conservation Service in Clark County. The ratings are based on localized soil conditions and their agricultural productivity. The ratings are: prime, unique, good and poor. In determining agricultural land only prime, unique and good were classified.

The following are the agricultural suitability ratings.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Soil Series (Mapping Unit)</u>	<u>Description</u>
Prime	Hillsboro loam, 0-3 (H1A)	These soils are the most prime in the County. They have the best climate, wide range of workability, least energy inputs, are very fertile and all crops adapted to the area can be grown.
	Hillsboro silt loam, 0-3 (HoA)	
	Hillsboro loam, 3-8 (H1B)	
	Hillsboro silt loam, 3-8 (HoA)	
Prime	Newberg silt loam, 0-3 (NbA)	These soils are prime where they are behind dikes. They are fertile, have good soil structure, are fairly easily worked, and a wide range of crops can be grown.
	Newberg silt loam, 3-8 (NbB)	
	Cloquato silt loam, 0-3 (CtA)	
	Sauvie silt loam, 0-3 (SmA)	These soils are prime where they are behind dikes. They are fertile, have good soil structure, are fairly easily worked, and a wide range of crops can be grown.
	Sauvie silt loam, 3-8 (SmB)	
	Sauvie silt Loam, sandy substratum, 0-3 (SnA)	
Sauvie silty clay loam, 0-8 (SpB)		
Unique	Semiahoo muck (Sr)	These soils are prime or unique for specialty crops where drained.
	Semiahoo muck, shallow variant (Su)	
	Tisch silt loam, 0-3 (ThA)	
Good	Sauvie silt loam, 0-3 (SmA)	These are the same soils as in Group 2, but are subject to periodical flooding. If diked they would be prime.
	Sauvie silt loam, 3-8 (SmB)	
	Sauvie silt loam, sandy substratum, 0-3 (SnA)	
	Sauvie silty clay loam, 0-8 (SpB)	
	Newberg silt loam, 0-3 (NbA)	
	Newberg silt loam, 3-8 (NbB)	
Cloquato silt loam, 0-3 (CtA)		

Gee silt loam, 0-8 (GeB)
Powell silt loam, 0-8 (PoB)

These are good, fertile soils, easily worked, but have a restrictive layer which limits some deep-rooted crops. Internal drainage is generally required for maximum use.

Fair

Hesson clay loam, 0-8
(Dobler) (HcB)

This soil, originally mapped Dobler, was lumped into the Hesson series. It is much better for agricultural uses than the Hessons. It has less clay content and is more easily worked.

Hillsboro loam, 8-15
(HlC)
Hillsboro silt loam,
8-15 (HoC)
Hillsboro loam, 15-20
(HlD)
Hillsboro silt loam,
15-20 (HoD)

These are the same soils as in Group 1, but repose on on steeper slopes, causing increased erosion hazards and equipment limitations.

Puyallup fine sandy loam,
0-3 (PuA)
Wind River sandy loam,
0-8 (WnB)
Wind River sandy loam,
8-20 (WnD)
Wind River gravelly loam,
0-8 (WrB)

These soils have good workability but some are subject to flooding on lower elevations where not diked. They are also drouthy and require irrigation for maximum crop yields.

Cinebar silt loam, 3-8
(CnB)
Cinebar silt loam, 8-20
(CnD)

Very deep soils with good workability, but they occur at higher elevations and climatic conditions become a limiting factor.

Fair

Hesson clay loam, 0-8
(HcB)

These soils, being higher in clay content, require increased energy inputs. Basic soil fertility is low. Cultivation is restricted because of the clay content and the narrow range of moisture needed for good tillability

Powell silt loam, 8-20
 (PoD)
 Sara silt loam, 8-20
 (SlD)
 Olympic clay loam, 8-20
 (OlD)
 Hesson clay loam, 8-20
 (HcD)
 Gee silt loam, 8-20
 (GeD)

These soils have restrictive layers and/or higher clay content, steeper slopes, and poor workability.

Dollar loam, 0-5 (DoB)*
 Sara silt loam 0-8 (SlB)
 Hockinson loam, moderately well drained, 0-8 (HuB)*

These soils have poor internal drainage and low fertility.

Lauren gravelly loam, 0-8
 (LgB)
 Vader silt loam, 3-8
 (VaB)
 Vader silt loam, 8-15
 (Vac)
 Lauren loam, 0-8 (LeB)

These soils range from a silt loam to gravelly loam which is drouthy with low fertility.

Cove silty clay loam, thin solum, 0-3 (CwA)
 Cove silty clay loam, 0-3 (CvA)
 Hockinson loam, 0-3 (HtA)
 Hockinson-Dollar loams 0-3 (HvA)
 McBee silt loam, 0-5 (McB)
 McBee silty clay loam, 0-3 (MeA)
 McBee silt loam, coarse variant, 0-3 (MlA)
 Odne silt loam, 0-5 (OdB)
 Olegua silt loam, 3-20 (OeD)
 Salkum silty clay loam, 3-15 (SaC)
 Washougal loam, 0-3 (WaA)
 Washougal gravelly loam, 0-8 (WgB)

Not color coded. Soils too poor for agricultural production.

Poor

*"Good" where drainage and fertilizer improvements have been made.

September 17, 2019

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Clark County Council
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Washington 98666

Re: 1993 GIS Metadata for Resource Land determinations and 1977 Criteria for Determining Broad Land Use Areas

Dear Councilors,


Clark County Citizens United, Inc. is distributing seven pages of testimony to each councilor and the county manager. These copies are of two very important documents, as it relates to resource land in Clark County. Combined, they tell the story as to how resource land was designated in 1977 and 1994. The data also helps the county to determine what they must do to correct the 2016 Comprehensive Plan to assure all resource land designations in Clark County are compliant to all RCWs and WACs mandated by the Growth Management Act.

The first page document is the 1993 Metadata that describes how the county determined all resource land for the 1994 Comprehensive Plan via an aerial photo and current use status. Those designations have not changed in the Comprehensive Plan, since that time. As you can see in the document, soils were not considered nor included. Soils are the primary way for a county to know where the most productive resource land is. The legislature knew this and wrote those directions and mandates into the Act that first the county is to look at the NRCS soils Manual and choose productive land that has prime and good soil.

The second series of six pages describes how the county determined resource lands in 1977, for the 1979 Comprehensive Plan, using the NRCS soils manual and data. These pages clearly describe what soils are prime, good, fair and poor and what the county used for the designations and why. This information was at the fingertips of the county planners and Commissioners in 1993 and 1994, because it was in the 1979 Comprehensive Plan. But all that data was ignored for a very different agenda of large lot zoning into resource land, regardless of the productivity of the land. In fact, the whole 1979 Comprehensive Plan was gutted and most of it ignored in 1994.

The county continues to be out of compliance to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearing Board as it relates to county wide and area wide re-evaluation of resource land in Clark County. Clark County Citizens expects the county to use the correct data and correct the 2016 Comprehensive Plan resource land designations, to show they followed the law and determined resource lands according to the mandates of the GMA.

Sincerely,



Carol Levanen, Exec. Secretary

Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604