



CP16#0538

Mr. David Madore, Chairman
Mr. Tom Mielke
Ms. Jeanne Stewart
Clark County Councilors

March 3, 2015

Re: Adding an Additional Alternative to the SEIS Analysis for the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update

Dear Councilors,

Rural landowner interests were provided the opportunity to work with County staff towards identification of elements of a new Alternative 4 to be considered in the ongoing Comprehensive Growth Management Plan (CGMP) update, with results due by March 3, 2015. This letter presents proposed elements of Alternative 4 that represent a compromise of the perspectives of many rural landowners involved in that process, but does not represent an agreement with County staff. We request that the Clark County Board of County Councilors (BOCC) approve these elements for consideration in a public review period that leads to a decision by the BOCC on April 8 for a formal decision on what elements, if any, are adopted for inclusion for analysis in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) that will analyze all alternatives in comparison to status quo.

The purpose of adding a new alternative, with appropriate elements, is to develop a reasonable range of alternatives that can be analyzed in the draft and final SEIS prior to a final decision by the BOCC at the end of the process. This proposed alternative focuses on rural areas only, because changes to rural areas currently planned for analysis falls far short of a reasonable range of alternatives to status quo. Current Alternative 2, the only alternative with changes to rural areas, was adopted via a process that was faulty in that no member of the public was provided the staff recommendation to limit rural alternatives to only one (Alternative 2), prior to the staff asking the BOCC to formally adopt Alternative 2 as the only alteration to status quo to be considered. Further, the public was not noticed nor allowed to provide comment on the staff recommendation that the rural elements in Alternative 2 be so limited in scope and substance from status quo. Deciding to consider a reasonably wide range of alternatives for analysis in a matter as important as this is not just simply good government—it makes for a better informed public policy decision in the end in a manner that is fully in accordance with existing law.

There has been much research and analysis into the need, legality and justification of these proposed elements for Alternative 4 that are not contained in this letter. What is attached to this letter below is a brief description of the proposed Alternative 4 elements in comparison to status quo and Alternative 2. In the event you wish to see more detailed written descriptions in the same level of detail as contained in the public record for Alternative 2, please don't hesitate to contact us. We believe each of the proposed

Alternative 4 elements can be presented in sufficient detail at a town hall meeting to obtain meaningful public comment on their merit for further analysis in the SEIS.

Sincerely,



Donald O. McIsaac, Ph. D

Distribution:

- Mr. Mark McCauley, County Manager
- Dr. Oliver Orjiako, Director of Community Planning
- Mr. Peter Silliman, BOCC Policy Analyst
- Ms. Susan Rasmussen, President, Clark County Citizens United
- Ms. Carol Levanen, Executive Director, Clark County Citizens United
- Mr. Jim Malinowski
- Rural Landowners Distribution

Proposed ALTERNATIVE 4 ELEMENTS COMPARED TO STATUS QUO AND ALTERNATIVE 2

<u>Feature</u>	<u>Status Quo</u>	<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>Proposed Alternative 4</u>	<u>Rationale/Comments</u>
Predominant Lot Size Process, w/o de-designation of FR or AG designtn.	not included	not included	Included	Recognition of rural character. Equity with neighbors. Several variations of "neighboring area" possible.
AG Minimum Lot	AG-20	AG-10	AG-5	Flexibility. Precedence in other Counties.
Forest Tier 2 Designation	FR-40	FR-20	FR-10	Flexibility. Precedence in other Counties.
Largest Rural Designation	R-20	single R design.	R-5	Recognition of rural characteristics, etc.
Intermediate Rural Designation	R-10	single R design.	R-5	Recognition of rural characteristics, etc.
Smallest Rural Designation	R-5	single R design.	R-5	Recognition of rural characteristics, etc.
Cluster Development in AG	not included	not included	Included	Flexibility. Precedence in other Counties.
Cluster Development in FR	not included	not included	Included	Flexibility. Precedence in other Counties.
Cluster Development in R	included	unclear	Included	Flexibility. Precedence in other Counties.
Urban Reserve and Urban Holding Overlay Releases and Revisions	not included	not included	included	URO and UHO to be lifted and either (A) revert to prior zoning, or (B) designated as business commercial
Recognize Existing R-Zoned Lots with min of R-2.5; R-5 similar rezone	not included	not included	included	Future flexibility. No new lots created.
Solid Type Updates	not included	not included	delayed process	Updates with most current science and implications to be delayed to a separate process that would start within 36 months; certainty of process to be instituted by formal inclusion as an Objective in the revised CMP

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Anderson, Colete
Sent: Wednesday, March 04, 2015 1:25 PM
To: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: Recommended Elements of Alternative 4 of the CMP Update
Attachments: Alt 4 Letter to BOCC 030315.docx

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, March 04, 2015 8:24 AM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete
Subject: FW: Recommended Elements of Alternative 4 of the CMP Update

Hey:

FYI. Email form Councilor Madore with attached letter from Don McIsaac. I will review later. Thanks.

Oliver

From: Madore, David
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2015 9:23 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: FW: Recommended Elements of Alternative 4 of the CMP Update

Oliver,

The attached file is what many of our rural citizens have asked to be analyzed in the SEIS for alternative Four. Please understand that these elements does not translate to a guaranty that every one of these will end up being selected in the final recipe. Rather, they've related that citizens would be better served and the intent of a EIS is better fulfilled when a wider range of alternatives is considered.

Peter Silliman has also submitted elements that may overlap or expand these elements to be considered.

Thank you very much for your patience and hard work as you always diligently go the second mile to help us help our citizens.

David

From: DONALD MCISAAC [<mailto:donalddmcsaac@msn.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2015 6:13 PM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Orjiako, Oliver; Silliman, Peter; Susan Rasmussen; Carol Levanen; jim.malinowski@icloud.com; Zachary McIsaac
Subject: Recommended Elements of Alternative 4 of the CMP Update

Please see attached letter regarding the Comprehensive Management Plan Update process.