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The bottom line points are that the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) fails totally to discuss the quantitative effects of the alternatives on the environment and rural life. Because of the above this the DSEIS is not an adequate analysis for creating a Preferred Alternative. Finally, Alternative 4, with its countywide rezoning and changes in minimum lot sizes, violates the goals of the Growth Management Act and significantly changes the nature of rural character.

The DSEIS does not provide quantitative analysis of any of the alternative’s impacts on water (streams, aquifers and wells), wildlife and fish habitat, resource lands (protection and use there of), infrastructure (traffic trips, utility services), human health (physical and mental), affordable housing, or transit. The DSEIS does not quantify these effects of the alternatives on Cities, rural centers or rural life. It states that mitigation is possible but does not define the necessary mitigations or give the effects or costs of mitigations.

Clearly, Alternative 1 will do the least damage to rural character. Current development has already added many wells. Even Alternative 1 will continue to affect rural water systems, ability to use resource lands, and habitat (see Dennis Dykes, submitted today).

Private land rights are only one of the many factors to balance within rural character and are not a Growth Management Hearings Board (GMHB) issue. The maintenance of rural character is. The courts have found Alternative 1 and its zoning consonant with both Growth Management and State law on land rights. (Input from Atty. David McDonald).

Again, the DSEIS fails quantitative analysis and it fails as an adequate basis for a final alternative. Alternative 4 violates the goals of the Growth Management Act.