

O'Donnell, Mary Beth



CP16#0519

From: Tilton, Rebecca
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2015 11:58 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: 4th Alternative comments from FOCC
Attachments: For the Record Proposal on Fourth Alternative.pdf

Hello,

Here are some comments from Sydney Reisbick.

Thanks - Rebecca

From: Cnty Board of County Councilors General Delivery
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2015 11:00 AM
To: Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; Stewart, Jeanne
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca
Subject: 4th Alternative comments from FOCC

From: Bianca Benson [<mailto:bianca@friendsofclarkcounty.org>]
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2015 10:24 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan; Cnty Board of County Councilors General Delivery
Subject: 4th Alternative comments from FOCC

For your consideration. Please submit to the record.

Thank you,

Bianca Benson
Executive Director
Friends of Clark County
503.701.9203
[visit our website](#)

Friends of Clark County
P.O. Box 513
Vancouver, WA 98666
friendsofclarkcounty.org



FEBRUARY 13, 2015

Board of Clark County Councilors

P.O. Box 5000, Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

Dear Sirs and Madams:

Subject: Proposal on Fourth Alternative

Sent via U.S. Mail with enclosures and via email to: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

For entry into record. Friends of Clark County supports county staff in their efforts to reject this new alternative at this late point in the Growth Management Planning process. FOCC is concerned about the financial cost of adding this fourth option at this time, the consequences of potentially falling out of compliance, and the appearance of impropriety in the process.

At the 1/21/15 GMP work session, staff was instructed to cancel the release of the completed Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). The SEIS is the analysis of impacts of proposed growth alternatives on human and natural environments. Blocking the release of the SEIS stopped the whole Growth Management process until the new alternative could be constructed, public input could be collected and analyzed and the environmental effects analyzed and added to the current SEIS. schools, emergency responders at all levels, justice, infrastructure planners (roads, water, etc) and interested groups, including Friends of Clark County were left without data they need to evaluate the first 3 alternatives and plan for future input.

We understand that staff members are worried that their participation in this project is dangerous, both to the County and to their professional ethics.

- The County could be in violation of the Growth Management Act.
- The process is far out of normal and not consistent with GMP development.
- Work sessions are traditionally for staff to give their expertise to the Councilors, not for Councilors to present major new unannounced proposals.

- The process seems to put the Councilors right back into staff duties despite the passage of a charter that intended to separate executive and legislative powers.
- There may be variance from good government principles.

There are several potential financial consequences of adding a new alternative at this late point.

- Cities and the County had budgeted for making their growth management plans. Now Cities must use money not budgeted for GMA work to look at potential consequences for them. The County must spend money to create, present and analyze the environmental effects of the new alternative.
- This, combined with changes in the first 3 alternatives, could put us into a full EIS. Staff estimates that this might cost about \$600,000.00 compared to the \$100,000.00 for the Supplemental EIS.
- Even if it does not, we the county taxpayers, will have to fund creation and both input and analysis for the new alternative.
- That process may make us late filing our GMP, putting us out of compliance with the Growth Management Act. This would mean that we would not be eligible for Washington State grants.

Regards,

Sydney Reisbick, President

Friends of Clark County, Board