

**From:** Robert Maul  
**To:** ["Jiri Vasat"](#)  
**Subject:** RE: SEPA appeal (APPEAL18-04), question about legal precedent - Grays Harbor, 1993 Supreme Court Decision  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 29, 2018 2:29:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [Notice of Consolidated Public Hearing - Grass Valley Master Plan.pdf](#)  
[image001.jpg](#)

---

Good afternoon, Jiri.

While there is disagreement with your assertion of the Grays Harbor decision as it relates to this case, the applicant has agreed to hold the consolidated hearing on June 18<sup>th</sup>. Please find the attached revised notice. This notice will be mailed out this week. As always, please let us know if you have other questions or need any additional information.

Regards,

Robert

---

**From:** Jiri Vasat [mailto:jvasat@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 29, 2018 2:11 PM  
**To:** Robert Maul  
**Subject:** Re: SEPA appeal (APPEAL18-04), question about legal precedent - Grays Harbor, 1993 Supreme Court Decision

Mr.Maul,

I did review recent City of Camas meetings. Hearing examiner meeting on 5/30 has documentation related to other SEPA appeal by City residents. I understand that appeal to SEPA decision 18-05 was granted.

Letter provided by attorney in case of SEPA 18-05 Camas Meadows Drive Street Improvement outlines that there should be 14 days period to allow for reply to SEPA appeal by city and to possible new appeal by AG residents

Legal document is based on WA Supreme Court decision State v. Grays Harbor County, 1993.

Using same assumption, **Consolidated Public Hearing** for Grass Valley development can't be held until 6/7/2018 (14 days from 5/24).

Please understand AG residents are not trying to stop development on this private land. Everybody understand that property rights of land/property owner needs be protected. We are just asking to be treated as an equal stakeholder, with same rights and access to decision making process as a developer.

We have provided viable proposals to limit impact of new development on wildlife and to protect quality of life of current tax paying citizens. Developer has to be open to compromise to assure everybody is comfortable.

Legal challenge development will only cost money AG residents, City of Camas and Developer, and will stall project approval process

**Suggestion how to reach compromise:**

- Will proposal to re-design 3 multifamily buildings on the south side to only two story on the south side considerable lower overall occupancy of all apartment complex? Impact on total renting revenue will be minimal. Impact on city taxes will be minimal. If revenue is paramount, there is space for additional apartment in the middle of development. **Impact on existing AG resident will be big...**

- Will moving parking lots on south side of the development to same distance as a apartment cause any significant financial harm to developer? Two story apartment will result in lower demand for parking spaces on the south side of development.

**Impact on existing AG resident is big...**

- How much will design change if Developer drops plans to "Regional Trail", moves south side apartments north by additional 50 ft? Regional trail will disrupt wildlife on the pond and at wetland. Moving apartments north will keep green belt and resting place for migratory birds and keep travel corridor for other species. **Overall impact will be big...**

Please let me know what is city response to demand to postpone Public Hearing to later date

I assume you communicate with Developer and you already advised that compromise is best way to resolve this situation

Thank you for your help,

Jiri Vasat

On Friday, May 25, 2018, 4:25:30 PM PDT, Robert Maul <[RMaul@cityofcamas.us](mailto:RMaul@cityofcamas.us)> wrote:

Good afternoon, Jiri.

I wanted to follow up with you that your SEPA appeal will be heard the same night as the Master Plan public hearing since it will be a consolidated hearing, pursuant to CMC18.55.165 (see reference below). The date and time is June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2018 at 7 pm, or soon thereafter located

at Camas City Hall in the Council Chambers. Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Regards,

**Robert Maul**

**Planning Manager**

City of Camas

616 NE 4<sup>th</sup> Ave.

Camas, WA 98607

[rmaul@cityofcamas.us](mailto:rmaul@cityofcamas.us)

(360) 817-1568 Ext. 4255



18.55.165 - SEPA threshold determinations and consolidated review.

A. Notice of Threshold Determinations. Under a consolidated review, notice of a threshold determination will be mailed to those agencies, individuals, or entities submitting comment within the comment period, and to all owners of record of the subject property, and all owners of real property generally located within three hundred feet of the subject property based on Clark County GIS records. Where a notice of public hearing is required, the threshold determination may be combined with such notice. An applicant is responsible for submitting a certified list of the property owners to be notified, and mailing labels of this list.

B. Public Hearing on Project Permit. If an open record predecision hearing is required for the underlying project permit application, the city shall issue its threshold determination at least fifteen days prior to the open record predecision hearing.

C. Consolidated Appeals. All SEPA related appeals, other than a DS, shall be consolidated with the open record hearing, or appeal, if any, on the underlying project application.

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE:** This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.