

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2016 8 26 AM
To: Alvarez, Jose, Anderson, Colete, Albrecht, Gary, Euler, Gordon, Hermen, Matt, Kamp, Jacqueline, Lebowsky, Laurie, Lumbantobing, Sharon, Wisner, Sonja, Schroader, Kathy
Cc: Cook, Christine
Subject: FW Thorpe report

All

FYI and for the record Thanks

From: Julie Olson [mailto:julie.olson@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2016 8:42 PM
To: McCauley, Mark; Stevens, Robert; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Fwd: Thorpe report

Just and FYI.

Julie Olson
360-609-3145

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>
Date: January 12, 2016 at 8:11:26 PM PST
To: Lonnie Moss <mossback44@gmail.com>, Susan Rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>, Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Thorpe report
Reply-To: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>

Hello All, On the last page of the report in the blue rectangle, it states all of the alternatives have too many lots etc for the rural area. It doesn't say particularly about resource areas, so I assume they are combined. What is interesting in this passage, is it qualifies it with the source, which was taken from the old DSEIS information on the table with the old assumptions. They are talking about apples and oranges. The report is only about the new assumptions and alt 4, and that last information refers to the old information regarding all of the alternatives. Why that is in there, is a mystery. Looking back at the new assumptions on Alt 4, it fits their calculations just fine and the other alternatives are very lacking and won't pass GMA tests of populations numbers. But, the chart confuses people to believe it is part of the overall information. It is not, and it clearly states where the source for that statement comes from the old assumptions. But, one must remember, that it is OK to exceed the calculated number in the assumptions, as long as they meet the OFM numbers to begin with. There is no way the state can predict and control growth. The only way is to have numbers too small that force growth somewhere, as is what is happening with the 90/10 split. The other counties used the actual numbers of populations, not growth. We clearly see in Councilor Madores charts that since 1994, the rate of growth in the rural housing has plummeted to almost nothing. The county should be encouraging growth, not continuing on the no growth path. But, using the growth in the urban areas and growth in the rural areas, does not really mean anything for planning purposes, unless you are doing social manipulation. If there is not housing in the rural areas, people have to go live in the urban areas, thus increasing the number there, and decreasing the number in rural lands. As Ron Barca said, it was not reality, it was a policy call. What a shame. In addition, the persons per household help to manipulate the numbers and Clark County has the highest, compared to the other counties. I don't know where that number comes from, but reality says it is 2.6, not 2.66. But, still, what data is that number based on. By simply changing the fraction of that number, increased household numbers quite a bit, over the 20 year span. As I see it, it is all in the numbers, or lack of, and these

numbers have clearly manipulated the result in a particular way. A reality check is needed, with data to back it up, and Councilor Madore's research and numbers have done that. In addition, please remember that the Superior Court and the Court of Appeals said that the population OFM numbers are not to be used to put a cap on rural growth. They also said it was erroneous for the county to use a vacant buildable lands analysis for the rural lands. These court rulings were never challenged and continue to stand today. Such analysis is to be used in the urban areas, only.

Best Regards, Carol

Best Regards, Carol

From: Lonnie Moss <mossback44@gmail.com>
To: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>
Cc: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>, DONALD MCISAAC <donaldmcisaac@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2016 6:32 PM
Subject: Re: Reader

Susan,

I have looked over Thorpe's draft. I thought it was poorly written and much of it was hard to follow. Having said that, however, I hate to admit that most of the conclusions are probably correct. For example, all legal non-conforming lots can obtain building permits in rural Clark County if they can get septic and water supply approval. They don't even have to meet the same setbacks as legal lots, but can use setbacks for the zone they most closely fit for size.

Even the conclusion about urban-rural split being closer to 90-10 than 86-14 is correct. While the existing population split is 86-14, the population growth (looking at any individual year) is closer to 90-10. To illustrate, the urban population grew by just over 100,350 between 2000 and 2014 while the rural population grew by 10,766. The total population increase was 111,116 and 90.3% went to urban areas while only 9.7% went to rural. The numbers in the right hand column are simply incorrect because they reflect the total population, not the rate of growth.

Lonnie

On Mon, Jan 11, 2016 at 8:23 PM, susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com> wrote
Hi Lonnie,

Happy New Year to you. Would you please give this a look over and tell us what you think?

Thanks,
Susan

Sent from Windows Mail