

PHASE 2: DRAFT EIS COMMENT PERIOD ENGAGEMENT AND OUTREACH SUMMARY

About the Draft EIS Comment Period

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) comment period extended from July 8 through September 8, 2025. Comments were collected via an online comment form available in English, Chinese, Chuukese, Russian, Spanish, Ukrainian, and Vietnamese, as well as via phone, email, and mail.

Outreach

Outreach methods informed people about the Draft EIS findings and directed people to the online StoryMap with an overview of the Draft EIS findings, public events, and the comment form and other comment methods.

- 4,300+ Be Heard visits
- 3,300+ StoryMap views
- 22 total e-newsletter emails sent through three City email lists.
 - 15 Our Vancouver email list
 - 3 Vancouver Connects email list
 - 4 Office of Neighborhoods email list
- 27 social media posts across 4 platforms garnered 69,454 unique views.
- 100+ community groups, neighborhood associations, and boards/commissions directly emailed.
- 2 interactive public meetings
 - One in east Vancouver on a weekday evening
 - One in west Vancouver on a weekend midday
- 2 public virtual sessions
 - One during weekday lunch hour
 - One during weekday evening
- 8 group-specific discussions
- 2 City Council Workshops and 1 Planning Commission Workshop
- 1 self-guided exhibit in the City Hall lobby
- 4 tabling events
- 7 locations with outreach materials
- Nearly 600 promotional video views, also shown at 3 Movie in the Park events

- 2 print articles – The Columbian and the City’s quarterly newsletter

Comments Received

The City received a total of 440 responses:

- 330 total responses from the online comment form, of which 24 responses were incomplete forms and did not contain a comment.
- 94 comments via email, 6 of which were also submitted via the online comment form or physical mail
- 15 comments via physical mail, 1 of which was also submitted via the online comment form or email
- 1 comment via voicemail

A total of 409 unique comments were received. Thirteen of these were received from agencies, businesses, or organizations.

Comment Review Process

The project team reviewed each comment and coded responses based on the chapters of the Draft EIS. The project team also added additional codes to capture comments related to the Draft EIS and Comprehensive Plan Update process. Comments were coded into multiple categories as overlap occurred.

- Alternatives
- Land and Shoreline Use
- Housing
- Aesthetics
- Historic and Cultural Preservation
- Transportation
- Noise
- Public Services and Utilities
- Earth
- Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases, and Climate
- Water
- Plants and Animals
- Other – Draft EIS Information, Data, and Approach
- Other – Engagement Process
- Other – Policies and Implementation
- Other – Annexation
- Other – Non-project

An additional sub-code was added for Alternatives to capture comments related to how alternatives impact a specific address, parcel, or neighborhood.

The summary section that follows may quantify comments received by the terms “few,” “some,” or “many.” *Few* means less than 10 comments received; *Some* or *several* means between 10–39 comments received; and *Many* means 40 or more comments received on a particular topic.

Summary of Key Themes

This section provides a high-level summary of key themes and takeaways associated with each code, as well as how many comments pertained to each code. Refer to the Final EIS to view comments and responses in full.

Alternatives: Specific Address, Parcel, Or Neighborhood (226 comments)

Many comments included suggestions for modifications to a specific address, parcel, or neighborhood in one or both alternatives. Frequently mentioned areas included the Southcliff and Fisher's Landing neighborhoods and the downtown waterfront area.

Alternatives (114 comments)

Alternative 1 received some support from those who expressed concerns about rapid change, parking, traffic, neighborhood character, and dense development. Some comments indicated support for Alternative 2 as the best way to address housing, climate, and transportation needs. Some comments indicated support for both alternatives. Many comments indicated opposition to both alternatives.

Transportation (95 comments)

Many comments mentioned a desire for increased transit and connectivity and pedestrian and bike improvements. A few comments indicated concern about parking shortages amidst higher density, opposition to MAX light rail expansion, and frustration with downtown pay-to-park policies.

Land and Shoreline Use (82 comments)

Some comments shared support for density that creates walkable, mixed-use areas, locating jobs, services, and restaurants or grocery stores closer to neighborhoods. A few comments opposed mixing low- and medium- density zones and increasing industrial land uses; emphasized a desire for protecting farmland and open space; and highlighted conflicts between public zoning changes and private neighborhood covenants.

Plants and Animals (43 comments)

Comments called for better protection of tree canopy, wildlife corridors, and natural habitats and indicated concern regarding vegetation loss due to increased density.

Housing (39 comments)

Some comments indicated a desire for a variety of housing options, affordable housing, and homeownership opportunities. Some comments expressed opposition to high-density housing, citing traffic, parking, and neighborhood impacts to character and safety.

Historic and Cultural Preservation (31 comments)

Some comments mentioned a desire to preserve older brick buildings in Downtown, Fort Vancouver, and Pearson Airfield. There were also a few suggestions to recognize the unique history of Vancouver and partner with Indigenous nations to preserve and honor their history as part of the city's story and legacy.

Other – Draft EIS information, data, and approach (25 comments)

Some comments included concerns that the EIS analysis does not adequately evaluate combined impacts of rezoning and middle-ground options between the two Alternatives. A few questions about the analysis related to houselessness, tree canopy, Critical Areas Ordinance, and rezoning were also shared.

Aesthetics (24 comments)

Comments emphasized the importance of neighborhood character, cohesive, high-quality development, and concerns about graffiti, trash, and homelessness.

Public Services and Utilities (18 comments)

Comments mentioned concerns that existing public utilities, including schools, police, fire, emergency services, and parks, are strained and will not be able to keep up with demand as the city grows.

Other – Engagement Process (16 comments)

Comments included concerns that engagement did not fully reach all demographics (especially renters, non-English speakers, low-income residents, and those without internet access), information shared was difficult to understand, and input was being overlooked.

Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases, and Climate (14 comments)

Comments included support for growth along transit lines to reduce vehicle miles travelled, concern about air pollution near freeways and industrial zones, and calls to increase climate resiliency through tree canopy, open space preservation, and solar power.

Noise (14 comments)

Comments mentioned noise concerns associated with traffic, mixed-use rezoning, and industrial traffic, and expressed desire for noise barriers and protections.

Water (13 comments)

Comments mentioned concerns about stormwater runoff and pollution, increasing area of impervious surfaces, and groundwater availability in the future.

Other – Non Project (8 comments)

Comments were unrelated to the Comprehensive Plan update, including feedback related to the Interstate Bridge Replacement Program.

Other – Annexation (5 comments)

Comments included questions from residents outside City limits about how their areas will be managed, desire for increased communication regarding the annexation process, and concerns that annexation could result in increased congestion and taxes.

Other – Policies and Implementation (3 comments)

Comments included skepticism about how the rezoning process will be implemented, desire for building permits to include requirements for parking and natural space, and emphasized the need for regulation of small electric vehicle use in bike lanes.

Earth (1 comment)

Comment shared concern about whether geologic and environmental hazards related to increased housing and commercial density in Southcliff were adequately considered.

Demographics of Commenters

The online comment form contained additional optional demographic questions. The following subsections summarize demographics of individuals who chose to respond to these questions.

Zip Codes (300 responses)

Comments came from 24 zip codes, including the City of Vancouver and surrounding areas in the urban growth boundary, Camas, and Washougal.

Gender (275 responses)

The gender breakdown of respondents is as follows:

- Female, 45.5% (125)
- Male, 40.0% (110)
- Non-binary, 0.4% (1)
- Transgender, 0.7% (2)
- Prefer not to answer, 14.0% (39)
- Self-identified, 0.7% (2)

Age (255 responses)

More than half of responses came from respondents over the age of 55. The age breakdown of respondents is as follows:

- Under 18 years, 1.2% (3)
- 18 – 24 years, 2.0% (5)
- 25 – 34 years, 7.8% (20)
- 35 – 44 years, 16.9% (43)
- 45 – 54 years, 12.9% (33)
- 55 – 64 years, 18.4% (47)
- Over 65 years, 40.8% (104)

Race/Ethnicity (271 responses)

Most respondents (61.6%) identified as white or European American. The racial/ethnic breakdown of respondents is as follows:

- American Indian or Alaska Native, 0.7% (2)
- Asian or Asian American, 4.4% (12)
- Black or African American, 1.9% (5)
- Hispanic or Latino/a/e, 4.4% (12)
- Middle Eastern or North African, 0.4% (1)
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 0% (0)
- White or European American 61.6% (167)
- Other, 2.2% (6)
- Prefer not to answer, 26.9% (73)

Language (223 responses)

48% of respondents said that they only speak English fluently, while 33.2% of respondents selected prefer not to respond. The most common language spoken by participants other than English was Spanish (8.1%). No responses were received in a language other than English.

Income (271 responses)

The income breakdown of respondents is as follows:

- Below \$19,999, 0.7% (2)
- \$20,000 – \$49,999, 3.7% (10)
- \$50,000 – \$89,999, 11.1% (30)
- \$90,000 – \$129,999, 11.4% (31)
- \$130,000 – \$149,999, 4.1% (11)
- Above \$150,000, 23.3% (63)
- Prefer not to answer, 45.8%, (124)

Disability (274 responses)

Approximately 9.1% of respondents have a disability.

Housing Situation (275 responses)

About three-quarters of survey participants (76.4%) own their house. Roughly 10.6% of respondents rent, and 2.2% live with someone but do not pay rent.