

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 3:14 PM
To: 'Gretchen Starke'
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; McCall, Marilee
Subject: RE: alternative 4



CP16#0600

Gretchen:

Thanks for the email. You're asking good questions.

In January, the Board asked that the SEPA (environmental review) process on the three previously agreed-to alternatives be halted so that a fourth alternative could be developed. What has taken place since that time is the development of a fourth alternative; Councilor Madore has done virtually all of the work in developing it. The reason for the open houses is to present the fourth alternative along with the other three.

What we need to do is to get the Board to agree on the alternatives so we can complete the environmental review process, a necessary step as you know in a comp plan update process. This is the purpose of the hearing on April 14. We are still planning on preparing a supplemental EIS; the SEIS will now have four alternatives instead of three. None of the concerns you raise below have been addressed, but will be in the SEIS, which is what we are trying to re-start and then finish. There will be a formal comment period on the draft SEIS as well as a public hearing.

Let me say again—from our standpoint, Alternative 4 is just another alternative in the environmental review process. It may seem that it is being trumpeted as what is going to happen, but we're simply trying to get to a decision about what the fourth alternative is so that it can be studied in the environmental review process, hopefully without too much more delay.

We'd be happy to meet with you at any time. Best to check with Marilee (e-mail in the cc line), as she handles Oliver's schedule.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

From: Gretchen Starke [<mailto:gstarke@pacifier.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 2:12 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: alternative 4

Gordy and Oliver,

First over all question: what is going on? My impression from the Columbian article Saturday and from what Sydney is e-mailing is that the 4th alternative is as firmly settled as a bowl of jello. How do I comment on something like this?

As conservation chair of the Vancouver Audubon Society, my biggest concern is for wildlife and habitat, including wetlands. Is there any analysis on how this 4th alternative would affect habitat in Clark County? What about listed species especially salmon? Would this

alternative encroach on wetlands and streams? How would alternative 4 interact with the county's critical areas ordinance?

Of course, as a citizen of Clark County, I am also concerned about the impact of alternative 4 on roads, schools, police and fire protection, and all other public services. Have there been any analyses of these impacts?

I realize that the staff has had little or nothing to do with the process of the way alternative 4 was developed -- if it is really developed -- and presented to the public. The process has been terrible, something you already know.

I can't go to the open house. I will be at the hearing on April 14. I plan to talk mostly about the process -- or lack thereof. I would like to address wildlife and other elements of an EIS, but feel I lack knowledge of specific impacts. Or am I being premature and that information will be available as the EIS is prepared? What is the status of the EIS, anyway?

If at all possible, I would like to schedule a meeting with one or both of you next week. I would prefer not on Wednesday, April 8. Thanks, and hang in there.

Gretchen Starke