Schroader, Kathy

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, December 17, 2015 4 55 PM
To: 'Wait, Judith Ann', Schroader, Kathy, Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose
Cc: Cnty Community Planning
Subject: RE Comments Re Rural Industrial Land Bank Environmental Review

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Okay, thank you for the correction

Regards,

Oliver

From: Wait, Judith Ann [mailto:judith.wait@wsu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, December 17, 2015 4:48 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy; Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose
Cc: Cnty Community Planning
Subject: Re: Comments Re: Rural Industrial Land Bank Environmental Review

Dear Oliver,

We're talking about the RILB process, which as you have said, is being conducted outside the Comp Plan process.

My comments on the RILB were submitted, and acknowledged by you, as indicated below, for the October comment period deadline on the RILB. You even said "Staff will work with our consultants to respond to all the comments received relating to the RILB."

I'm sure we're both quite busy right now, so don't worry about being so quick to respond, although I do appreciate it

I know I recommended the processes be linked, but I was clear about what I was commenting about. And of course the processes have not been linked, except by those of us very concerned about the ongoing loss of farmland facilitated by the planning processes which de-designate Ag land and foster parcelization.

Best wishes,
Jude

From: Orjiako, Oliver <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 17, 2015 4:36 PM
To: Wait, Judith Ann, Schroader, Kathy, Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose
Cc: Cnty Community Planning
Subject: RE Comments Re Rural Industrial Land Bank Environmental Review

Hello Jude

Thank you for your quick reply I am glad to hear that your comment submitted yesterday are in the PC record.

If you submitted comment on the SEPA process relating to the published DSEIS for the comp plan update, the comment period for that closed on September 17, 2015. Staff will retain your comment but just know that it is not timely It will be part of those comments that came after the DSEIS comment period closed I hope this is helpful Thank you for your continued interest in the Clark County planning process

Best,

Oliver

From: Wait, Judith Ann [mailto:judith.wait@wsu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, December 17, 2015 4:24 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy; Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose
Cc: Cnty Community Planning
Subject: Re: Comments Re: Rural Industrial Land Bank Environmental Review

Hi Oliver,

Yes, I see my comments submitted yesterday are in the PC record.

But I expected that my October comments should have been included in the SEPA comments, and thereby considered in the SEPA response

good luck with the Hearing,

Jude

From: Orjiako, Oliver <Oliver Orjiako@clark wa gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 17, 2015 4:18 PM
To: Wait, Judith Ann; Schroader, Kathy, Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose
Cc: Cnty Community Planning
Subject: RE Comments Re. Rural Industrial Land Bank Environmental Review

Hello Judith

Your comment is included under the PC comments for tonight hearing Thanks

Oliver

From: Wait, Judith Ann [mailto:judith.wait@wsu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, December 17, 2015 3:16 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy; Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose
Cc: Cnty Community Planning
Subject: Re: Comments Re: Rural Industrial Land Bank Environmental Review

Dear County planners,

Am I missing something? I do not see my comments included in the public record for the SEPA comments.

Thanks,

Jude

From: Orjiako, Oliver <Oliver Orjiako@clark wa gov>
Sent: Thursday, October 22, 2015 10 52 AM
To: Wait, Judith Ann, Schroader, Kathy, Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose
Cc: commplanning@clark wa gov
Subject: RE Comments Re. Rural Industrial Land Bank Environmental Review

Good morning Jude

This is to acknowledge receipt of your email and the comment attached Staff will work with our consultants to respond to all the comments received relating to the RILB.

The RILB is an application submitted by Mr Dennis Lagler to the county February 13, 2014 to designate a rural industrial land bank As a result, it is the county obligation to process it As you know the site was included in the 2007 plan and was included in the 2007 EIS The county lost the inclusion of the site in the urban growth area of Vancouver on appeal

The county is processing the application under the requirements of RCW 36 70A 367 The provisions of RCW 36 70A 367 sunsets December of 2016. The timeline and due date for the county comp plan update is on or before June 30, 2016. We could have combined to two processes but choose not to do so given the different timeline and requirements Broadly speaking the 2007 EIS and Capital Facilities Plan included the said site however additional infrastructure analysis and programmatic environmental work are part of the current review of the application A thorough de-designation analysis and alternative site analysis was conducted I don't know if the county will be successful in designation of the site as a rural industrial land bank as provided in RCW 36 70A .367 Thank you for your comment and interest in the planning process Please, let me know if you have questions

Best,

Oliver

From: Wait, Judith Ann [mailto:judith.wait@wsu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2015 8:42 PM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Cc: commplanning@clark.wa.gov; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Comments Re: Rural Industrial Land Bank Environmental Review

Dear Oliver,

Attached are my comments on the RILB to the County's policy makers and Planning departments To put it bluntly, I see yet another significant impact from any proposed additional de-designation of agricultural land. And the proposed impacts are not mitigated. So, I "vote" NO, with all due respect for the Lagler Dairy.

I'm curious why you are having an open house after the deadline for public input on the LB?

Thanks for this opportunity to have some input. Is there a place to find responses and replies to public comments on this RILB process or the Comp Plan update? It's hard to figure out if comments are actually considered, and if so, when and how. It's not that I have time to follow. Certainly farmers are already over-busy growing food and such.

Similarly, did the Planning Commission recommendations hearing this week include public comment? It's been a month since the Sept 17 deadline for Comp Plan comments. Did any of those comments carry forward?

Best wishes,

Jude

From: Schroader, Kathy <Kathy Schroader@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 7, 2015 7.07 AM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: Rural Industrial Land Bank Environmental Review

Rural Industrial Land Bank update:

An addendum to the 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement in the form of a programmatic environmental review has been prepared regarding the Rural Industrial Land Bank (RILB). This document includes a review of environmental factors for the application site and contains mitigating measures as required in the form of a master plan concept and proposed development regulations

Both the 2007 Environmental Impact Statement and the addendum can be found at www clark wa gov/planning/landbank

The public is invited to comment on the addendum Comments on the addendum are due **October 21, 2015**, and can be made as follows

- Post a comment online Engage Clark County
- Send us an email at commplanning@clark wa gov
- Mail your comments:
  Clark County Community Planning
  Attn. Rural Industrial Land Bank
  P.O. Box 9810, Vancouver, WA 98666-9810

Another open house is scheduled for **Thursday, October 29, 2015** at the CASEE Center, 11104 NE 149th Street, Brush Prairie, from 5 30-7 00 p m All of the materials required by the Growth Management Act will be available for review and will be discussed

More information on the Rural Industrial Land Bank project can be found at www clark.wa gov/planning/landbank

Thank you,

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

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