



Wiser, Sonja

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2016 8:50 AM
To: Albrecht, Gary, Alvarez, Jose, Anderson, Colete, Euler, Gordon, Hermen, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline, Lebowsky, Laurie, Lumbantobing, Sharon, Orjiako, Oliver, Schroader, Kathy, Wiser, Sonja
Subject: FW: Timber Lands Exclusion

All

FYI Kathy, please index as this is now public Thanks

From: Horne, Chris
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 4:13 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: FW: Timber Lands Exclusion

From: Pool; Bob
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 4:09 PM
To: Horne, Chris
Subject: Timber Lands Exclusion

Chris,
You asked me to clarify what the differences between the alternative 4 potential housing numbers in the DEIS and the plan November 24 plan

I have investigated this and discovered that the following
The rural analysis has included the following exclusions.
Parcels less than 1 acre
Tax Exempt
Timber
Water
Private streets
Right of way
Utilities
Private parks
Mining land
Zero Value property

The rural lands analysis process was rewritten in this past summer because the existing script was no longer working due to changes in software technology, and data sources
One of the changes made was with the Timber exclusion In the past the Timber exclusion was based on a set of owner names This criteria was revised to be property in forest zoning and in DFL current use or Timber current use

The rural analysis was completed with the changes, the results were reviewed and they looked reasonable and were sent in for the DEIS

In August someone asked why were we excluding timber lands And how many potential homes were being excluded because of timber GIS turned off the timber exclusion and reran the model to see what the impacts were This information was delivered to Community Planning and no further actions were taken on this what if question Unfortunately, GIS staff neglected to turn the timber exclusion back on This was an oversight that did not get noticed until November It did not get noticed until someone compared the results of final iteration of Councilor Madore's Alternative 4 to the one in the DEIS and realized that there was a difference

The error was discovered in November 2016 it was even called out in the Planning Department's response to the "Planning Assumption Choices A and B" document

In a phone call with Councilor Madore on Monday February 22nd I talked with him about this error, and he seemed to be familiar with it.

We strive to document and share our analysis and processes and are not familiar with any secret layers, or behind the scenes requests to manipulation of the analyses

I know that GIS staff regrets this oversight and has looked into how could this have been prevented. Our conclusion is that the process was out of the ordinary from the start We were trying to understand/ reconstruct/verify what Councilor Madore was doing. This is backwards from the traditional process where we do analysis and verify results and present those results to the public for further review

Best,
Bob Pool

GIS Manager
360-397-2092 x 4654
<http://gis.clark.wa.gov>