

Schroader, Kathy



From: Jerry Olson <jolson@olsonengr.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2015 2:35 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Drqft EIS on Comp Plan

Let me offer these brief comments on the EIS:

- 1) The EIS does not adequately analyze the impacts of the gross underestimation of the population projection, and what that result would be to the community and the environment.
- 2) The EIS does not adequately address the impacts of assuming that over half of the critical land in the Urban Growth Boundary will be built on to full density. What are the alternatives to avoid or minimize that occurrence?
- 3) The EIS does not acknowledge the addition of biodiversity habitat lands in the Urban Growth Boundary that would reduce the amount of buildable vacant land as shown on the buildable lands model, or the result of building on over half of it.
- 4) The infrastructure assumption does not allow for adequate storm water set aside to treat water pollution.

I support Alternative 4 in the plan over the other choices, but it does not add enough land to the Urban Growth Boundaries to satisfy GMA.

Jerry Olson
222 East Evergreen Blvd
Vancouver, WA 98660