

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 1 19 PM
To: Albrecht, Gary, Alvarez, Jose, Anderson, Colete, Euler, Gordon, Hermen, Matt, Kamp, Jacqueline, Lebowsky, Laurie, Lumbantobing, Sharon, Orjiako, Oliver, Schroader, Kathy, Wisner, Sonja
Subject: FW a least preferred "preferred alternative" possibility the prudent person possibility?

FYI and for the record Thanks

From: Heather [<mailto:htischbein@wa-net.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 11:31 AM
To: Olson, Julie (Councilor)
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: a least preferred "preferred alternative" possibility ..the prudent person possibility?

This email is being submitted as testimony for the record of the Joint Planning Commission-County Council hearings on the GMA of May 19 and 24, 2016

Julie,

In the interest of suggesting a possible solution to the immediate conflicted circumstance

It was a surprise to me that the possibility of not making the June 30, 2016 deadline for submission of our comp plan update was actually talked about at last night's, May 24, public hearing on the preferred alternative

When I asked myself the "what would a prudent person do?" question in this regard, it occurred to me that there was perhaps a least preferred "preferred alternative" to fall back on in order to make the Dept of Commerce deadline AND create a "thinker space" in which the community would have the time to thoughtfully address together all the disagreements, the real and imagined conflicts, the fractures and flash points that the GMA update process to date has surfaced

What would it look like to fall back on submitting Alternative One, for now, a plan that we know is GMA compliant and would at least remove the possibility, and the cost of litigation, while the county regroupes and comes up with a way of dealing with all the issues that have been raised and that will be decided in litigation if "we" don't do something different as a community to design a comp plan update that reflects the best thinking of a diverse community of people in a rapidly developing rural-urban-interface (RUI) county? What could/would it look like if we had the time to broadly engage citizens in a design conversation-process that included updates on all the information that needs updating (for example, all the information pertaining to the "value and viability of agriculture in Clark County) and access to current information that needs to be created to better understand interdependent and cumulative environmental and economic impacts of various proposed options in service of creating a real "integrated comprehensive plan" for our collective future? One thing that disagreeing parties currently agree on is the inadequacy of the final EIS and the functional reality of Capital Facilities Plan So why keep pursuing the preferred option currently in play?

Is there a holding pattern that would make sense to prudent people, people who have real differences in desired outcomes, that would allow a civic engagement process to take place that would result in a truly community-designed comprehensive plan for a future that works for all, based on agreed upon "facts" and identified shared values, and upon creative collaboration in service to diverse points of views, values and beliefs, rather than a plan everyone appears to

object to and based on poorly negotiated compromises (if negotiated at all) made in power over circumstances and that yield a future that may work for a few people some of the time, but not for most of the people most of the time?

I remember that you had no interest in going retro, in going with Alternative One a couple of weeks ago but is it possible that Alternative One may be a better alternative than what's on the table right now including the alternative of being late and ending up with a proposed alternative that would still be litigated Why would "we" do that?

Isn't that the worst possible scenario? I don't know if this is helpful, but it is my attempt to suggest a solution rather than just complain

Respectfully,

Heather Tischbein