

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver .
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 9 51 AM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW 2016 Comp Plan SEIS

FYI and for the record Thanks

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 9:32 AM
To: 'Sharese Graham'
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: RE: 2016 Comp Plan SEIS

Sharese

Thank you for providing this information as we requested We will forward it to the councilors and put it into the comp plan record

Gordy

From: Sharese Graham [<mailto:SGraham@esassoc.com>]
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2015 5:45 PM
To: Euler, Gordon; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan SEIS

Oliver & Gordy-

You requested that ESA outline the options, as we see them, for moving the County's Comprehensive Plan SEPA process forward taking into consideration the Preferred Alternative adopted by the Board of County Councilors on November 24, 2015. ESA would like to propose one of the following two options for proceeding:

1. ESA would perform a basic analysis of the Preferred Alternative in order to complete the Final SEIS by February 1, 2016. The Final SEIS would outline the changes in planning assumptions and methodology, and would disclose that the Preferred Alternative is not directly comparable to the alternatives analyzed in the Draft SEIS due to those changes. The analysis would not be performed at the same level of detail as the alternatives included in the Draft SEIS, and in accordance with SEPA requirements, would incorporate worst case analysis where data or other information is lacking. The ability to meet the schedule would depend upon receiving a well-defined description of the Preferred Alternative almost immediately, a timely contract amendment, and an understanding by County reviewers that the internal review period will be very compressed. There would be no public review period following release of the Final SEIS.

2. ESA would conduct a thorough analysis of the Preferred Alternative and re-analyze Alternatives 1-4 with the new planning assumptions and methodology. ESA would issue a second Draft SEIS that would be subject to the public review process. This option would require an extension of the schedule, with a Final SEIS likely issued sometime in the spring of 2016. This is ESA's preferred option for completing the SEPA compliance process.

Both of these options would require additional analysis and an amendment to ESA's contract, although the second option would require more budget than option 1. Please also note that under either of these options, ESA would clearly disclose that the planning assumptions, methodology, and direction for proceeding with the SEPA process comes from Clark County. The analysis of environmental impacts of the Preferred Alternative, or of all of the alternatives, would be objective and independent from the County's process.

We are currently preparing a more detailed description of each of these options, including required scope and budget amendments, which will be submitted to you tomorrow, December 1st. If you have any questions in the meantime, please feel free to give me a call.

Sharese Graham

Senior Planner

ESA | Northwest Community Development

5309 Shilshole Avenue NW, Suite 200

Seattle, WA 98107

206.789.9658

sgraham@esassoc.com | www.esassoc.com

Sent via the Samsung GALAXY S® 5, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone