

RECEIVED

SEP 4 2008

LONG RANGE
PLANNING DIVISION

**Foothills Friends (FHF) Comments
for**

Public Hearing on the SEIS

Sept. 4, 2008

Presented by Martha Sirguy (board member) on behalf of FHF

My name is Martha Sirguy; I am a board member of FHF. On behalf of the Board of FHF I present seven points of comment regarding the SEIS. These points will be followed later by an expanded comment letter from FHF to the Planning Commission and others at the Planning Department. Please refer any questions to this forthcoming letter.

Point 1

Since the 2009 population projections are to be completed in time to meet the June 2009 Growth Management Board decision regarding the County's UGA, these more current population projections should be utilized rather than the old projections.

Issues raised in the Subarea Committee Minority Report and Minority Supplement regarding the historical flaws in calculation of the 2002 and the 2006 projections, and the need for logarithmic projections instead of exponential projections, need to be addressed when the 2009 projections are performed.

Point 2

The 2008 traffic counts and analysis taken by FHF in February and March 2008, together with the Tilghman Group critiques of the County's traffic report, should be taken into consideration and incorporated into the Final SEIS.

Point 3

The quantitative/numerical groundwater modeling for Kendall Creek which was recommended by Aspect Consulting in its Water Quality and Quantity Report for the SEIS, should be mandated and required by the County now, and the results incorporated into the Final SEIS.

Point 4

Since Balfour Village has introduced new (2008) material proposing an initial reduction in size and deletion of school and commercial center, the county should not use Balfour Village's old 2005 assumptions of size and configuration in the SEIS. The SEIS should not rely at all on permit applications which have not received County approval.

(FHF Comments, p.2)

Point 5

Too much information is missing in the SEIS. The Final SEIS should address all of these issues. By way of example, the following are either missing in the SEIS or are acknowledged in the SEIS as being incomplete:

- **fish analysis regarding water quality and quantity issues for the Kendall hatchery and for wild fish in Kendall Creek**
- **the impact of two previously unidentified land fills on Kendall Road within the Wellhead Protection Areas for the Peaceful Valley Water District, which are not addressed in the water quality and quantity analysis**
- **determination of light industrial sewer and water needs**
- **determination of the cost and hard source of funding for mitigation.**

Point 6

The assumption in the SEIS that all impacts can be mitigated when we lack answers to missing material is totally premature! The Final SEIS should not be issued until all of these answers have been obtained; otherwise the assumption of full mitigation is irresponsible.

Point 7

Foothills Friends supports Alternative 3 as the most fitting for maintaining rural character and protecting the environment, as well as most fiscally prudent.