

**Schroader, Kathy**

---



**From:** Euler, Gordon  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 23, 2015 10:08 AM  
**To:** Schroader, Kathy  
**Subject:** FW: Comp Plan Update DEIS

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Kathy:

For the index.

Gordy

---

**From:** McCauley, Mark  
**Sent:** Monday, July 20, 2015 3:26 PM  
**To:** Euler, Gordon; Cook, Christine; Horne, Chris  
**Subject:** FW: Comp Plan Update DEIS

All, which of these are legitimate matters to address with Councilor Madore?

---

**From:** Madore, David  
**Sent:** Monday, July 20, 2015 10:50 AM  
**To:** McCauley, Mark  
**Subject:** Comp Plan Update DEIS

Mark,

I ask for your authorization to work with our team to most efficiently refine our Comprehensive Plan Update documents. I've read through the draft and would like to discuss with you the following topics:

Page 1-2 has a note at the bottom that says Alt-4 will change the urban / rural split. We will need to do three things to determine that new ratio. 1) Update the actual rural map to remove some of the inappropriate parcels including the Rural Industrial Land Bank, parcels adjacent to the UGBs, and parcels identified by GIS that should have been excluded. 2) Update our population growth rate numbers (on page 1-2) to better align with the latest OFM report (Clark County now being the 2<sup>nd</sup> fastest growing county in the state). 3) Calculate the new ratio.

Updating the Vacant Buildable Lands Model – a \$13,000 home is not realistic for an inhabitable home. We need to bump that number up significantly. Our GIS database should be able to provide us with a graph of property values vs. occupancy. That information should provide us with an objective evidence-based “show your work” threshold. I do not believe we endorse the \$13,000 number without that necessary basis. I talked with Bob Pool this morning and he states

that yes, our database includes the necessary information to easily produce that informative graph. I green light from you to authorize it would be appreciated.

Throughout the first four chapters (which is all that we have at this point), there are numbers on many pages that specify the number of lots and number of acres affected by Alternatives 2 and 4. I would like to compare their XLS tables to the ones that we used to generate the maps that we presented in our two open houses. To check our math for accuracy, please provide a link to those files.

I do not see any of the guiding principles that commissioners presented on our March 11, 2015 Power Point Presentation. I do not want to lose sight of that foundation. We've gained even more insight now that we are further along and have had multiple conversations with citizens in our two open houses. How do we finalize and incorporate an updated list of concise guiding principles and "show your work" notes that will serve as important basis and justification documentation for the plan that we will finally adopt?

Page 3-6 and 3-8 states that Alternative-4 could have moderate impact on water resources. Page 3-10 says it will have a high impact. I need to know the specifics behind that statement. Which water resources, aquifer consumption, or runoff into streams? Our water quality and stormwater laws require that runoff after development must be limited to pre-European conditions and the purity must not be compromised. If the concern is the consumption of aquifer water through wells, since rural development returns virtually all of that water to the ground (not to sewer systems), it may fallacious to assert otherwise. We need the basis for this claim.

Page 3-10 refers to basins becoming more urbanized. Alternative-4 does not urbanize any properties. So it appears to be an inappropriate implication that it does. The DEIS is to identify impacts. This is not an appropriate concern for Alt-2 or 4.

Page 4-4 states that land managers expressed concern about conversion of AG and FR lands to development. That appears to me to be a misleading statement as Alternatives 2 and 4 do not convert or de-designate any rural AG or FR zones to other uses. This wording can be misunderstood to imply that it does. Allowing smaller AG and FR zones does not "develop" these lands. Rather, Alternative-4 recognizes that many of these parcels are already smaller and smaller parcels facilitates more manageable lot sizes for more landowners to be more successful growing local crops. The cluster options that we adopted as part of Alternatives 2 and 4 were included specifically to mitigate impacts. The DEIS should make that point.

Pages 4-22 and 4-24 state that increased stormwater runoff can affect wetland hydrology. True. But if I understand correctly, DOE law does not allow alternative 2 or 4 to increase stormwater runoff. So this statement appears inappropriate as it implies that these alternatives will violate that law.

I look forward to your blessing so we can effectively work as a team toward an optimized plan.

Thank you,

David