

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2015 4:34 PM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: Comp Plan existing structures

For index. Thanks

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2015 5:31 PM
To: McCauley, Mark
Cc: Alvarez, Jose; Orjiako, Oliver; Pearrow, Ken
Subject: RE: Comp Plan existing structures

Mark:

We believe we have provided ESA with what they need to craft their analysis. We can provide Councilor Madore an explanation of what that is at any time.

Have a good weekend.

Gordy

From: McCauley, Mark
Sent: Thursday, July 09, 2015 4:53 PM
To: Euler, Gordon
Subject: Re: Comp Plan existing structures

What about the column of data that he refers to that we didn't give to ESA. He wants us to give that data to them. Any problem with doing that?

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 9, 2015, at 4:42 PM, Euler, Gordon <Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

Mark:

Using our GIS data, ESA came up with slightly different numbers for the number of new lots that would be created under the various SEIS alternatives. We've been working with ESA to resolve the differences, which boiled down mostly to a difference in rounding methods.

Councilor Madore was down in Community Planning this afternoon, wanting to make sure we would get to him whatever we are receiving from ESA. We have now given him a copy, (and, on the advice of Chris, copies to all the councilors and you) of the first four DSEIS chapters. I mentioned that one could use the same data and get different numbers depending on the assumptions or methodology used. I used the *example* of a 5-acre lot. If its zoning were changed to 2.5 acres, there would now be two new lots. But if there was a house on the 5 acres then there really is only one new (buildable) lot. What I was trying to illustrate was that agreeing on assumptions and methodology is important. With regard to

the DSEIS, we are only reporting new conforming vacant lots—lots that are already built are not counted in the number of new lots in any of the alternatives. The data that will be in the DSEIS will show this.

Gordy

From: McCauley, Mark
Sent: Thursday, July 09, 2015 3:27 PM
To: Euler, Gordon
Subject: Fwd: Comp Plan existing structures

Gordy, what's the story here?

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Madore, David" <David.Madore@clark.wa.gov>
Date: July 9, 2015 at 3:21:58 PM PDT
To: "McCauley, Mark" <Mark.McCauley@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: **Comp Plan existing structures**

Mark,

I touched bases with Gordy on the Comp Plan update process. He made a good point that sounds like we ought to act on to make ESA much better equipped to produce the EIS.

We delivered the GIS data files that listed every property defined by Alternative 4. But we did not include an important column in those records, Existing structure Yes / No.

That column would indicate if the parcel has an existing structure. If not, then a new structure could potentially be added if the proposed lot size allowed it. If a structure is already existing on that parcel, then that lot would not count as a potentially new structure.

Please support our planning staff and ESA to equip them for maximum smart efficiency so they don't have to guess at when our data can provide the answer to every record. Since they are well into the project, I assume that timeliness is appropriate. Please copy me with that data and map too.

Thank you,

David