

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2015 2:53 PM
To: Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose, Anderson, Colete
Cc: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW Seeking Clarification

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Just FYI and for the record Thanks

From: Heather Tischbein [<mailto:htischbein@wa-net.com>]
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2015 2:47 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Re: Seeking Clarification

Thank you, Oliver

----- Original Message -----

From: Orjiako, Oliver
To: 'Heather Tischbein', Euler, Gordon
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2015 1:50 PM
Subject: RE Seeking Clarification

Good morning Heather

Thank you for your email and inquiry. Please, see my response below each question. Gordy may add more later this afternoon as he is out of the office this morning.

From: Heather Tischbein [<mailto:htischbein@wa-net.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2015 9:52 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: Seeking Clarification

Gentlemen,

Will you please clarify for me

1) what exactly was the decision made at the end of the Monday, Nov. 9 joint work session of the county council and the planning commission,

The decision was to have two open house style meetings from 5:30 - 7 p.m. on Monday, Nov. 16 at Hockinson High School and on Tuesday, Nov. 17 at the Ridgefield High School. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on Thursday, Nov. 2015 at 6:30 p.m. to consider the proposed planning assumptions and the associated maps.

2) what staff has been directed to do towards what purpose as a result of the decision that was made at the joint work session,

Same as above. The Board on a 2 to 1 vote directed staff to present Choice B Proposed Changes to Planning Assumptions and the revised Alternative 4 maps: Rural, Forest, and Agriculture. The proposed choice B change to planning

assumptions and the revised Alternative 4 are under the Joint Work Session on the Comprehensive Plan Update dated 11/9/2015

3) what the legal implications are of introducing an Alternative 5 (which I believe to be a more accurate name than Alternative-4B) at this point of the process,

The Board says that they are not introducing an Alternative 5

4) whether or not Madore's assertions are true that Alternative 1 is out of compliance with GMA or "illegal" in some way, and

No

5) whether or not Madore worked directly with GIS staff to develop new assumptions and check his scrubbed data, and if so, when and from whom did he get authorization to do so and was this authorization in alignment/compliance with the structure of government stipulated in the new charter

I do not have any knowledge of this and therefore could not answer. I believe that the GIS Manager sitting at the table commented that they provided the numbers in column 2 and 4 based on Councilor Madore's assumptions and methodology

Even though I attended the planning commission's work session on 11/5 and the joint work session on 11/9, I am still confused about what is going on and what the implications and consequences are of the county council submitting a preferred alternative that wasn't included in the DSEIS. How is it determined whether or not the changes in assumptions and data that Madore has applied to Alternative 4 are "significant" enough to trigger a reset of the whole process? And what are the implications of using different sets of assumptions and data in one alternative compared to all the others?

I appreciate how very busy you both must be and I regret having to ask these questions. However, as a citizen, I am quite confused not so much about what is happening and why, but how it is happening and what the consequences/impacts are especially what the unintended consequences could be

I will appreciate your attention to these questions. Keep up the good work,

Most gratefully,

Heather Tischbein

I hope this is helpful. Please, let me know if you have further questions. Thank you

Best,

Oliver

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law