

**Schroader, Kathy**

---



**From:** Euler, Gordon  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 25, 2015 8:56 AM  
**To:** 'Heather Tischbein'  
**Cc:** Schroader, Kathy  
**Subject:** RE: Capital Facilities Plan

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Heather:

Excellent observation and question. Costs and revenues are an important component of the comp plan, and the Capital Facilities Plan is a GMA requirement.

The intent of the SEPA process (in this case a supplemental EIS) is to document in a general sense what the potential *environmental* impacts might be from the various alternatives. The EIS is an environmental document, not an economic or financial document. We have some idea what the costs could be for Alternative 1, because a CFP was prepared in 2007 to cover the planning horizon out to 2024. Alternative 3 is the only alternative that adds land to urban growth areas, and those lands added would have to be annexed before they are developed, so the impact isn't much. Alternative 4 would of course change the way services are delivered in the rural area.

The issue is really one of timing—the SEPA process is completed prior to and leading to the preferred alternative, and the CFP is developed based on the preferred alternative. Should there be an Economic Impact Statement to go along with the Environmental Impact Statement? Certainly not a bad idea, but the way the process is structured we focus on costs of the proposal rather than the alternatives.

The CFP will be part of what is adopted, and it will be part of the public deliberation. We will commence to getting it prepared when the Board picks the preferred alternative, which hopefully will be in October.

Does that help?

Gordy

---

**From:** Heather Tischbein [<mailto:htischbein@wa-net.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 25, 2015 7:52 AM  
**To:** Euler, Gordon  
**Cc:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Subject:** Capital Facilities Plan

Gordy,

I have a question/concern re section 8, Public Facilities and Utilities that I would like entered into the public record.

Section 8.3.1 states that public service and utility providers were contacted for information on how the alternatives being considered would impact their services, but the DSEIS doesn't present details on cost and revenue projections nor analysis or interpretation of the information received, other than the oft-repeated and self-evident summary statement that Alternative Four would have the highest potential for impacts due to the most potential for intensive development.

The statement in section 8.3.3 on page 8-10 hints at impacts to taxpayers and ratepayers: "Unavoidable adverse impacts would result only if the revenue was not available to expand public facilities and utilities to the required levels of service." The "only if" caveat is big here, given all the variables involved in securing "revenue".

I am assuming that these very important practical details re costs and revenues are addressed in the Capital Facilities Plan, since they aren't addressed in the DSIES. Is this a correct assumption?

When do actual costs and revenue projections, the potential financial implications to taxpayer and ratepayers associated with these alternatives, become available to the public for their consideration and input to the council?

I'm having a hard time understanding how a citizen is to think wisely about these choices w/o better facts about financial implications. We all know that more development means more infrastructure costs, even in a mandated "phased development" scenario as suggested by the DSEIS as a possible mitigation measure. As a taxpayer and ratepayer who is going to have to ante up to fund these projects, I would appreciate knowing some real numbers associated with these alternatives.

When does a Capital Facilities Plan become part of this public deliberation?

Thanks for clarifying these concerns,

Heather Tischbein