



DOUGLAS COUNTY GOVERNMENT
Public Works Department

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of C470 Financial Analysis & Implementation Committee

FROM: Duane Fellhauer, Director of Public Works

DATE: July 14, 2005

RE: Upcoming FAIC Meeting - July 22, 2005

I would like to share a concern regarding the third and final scheduled meeting of the C470 Financial Analysis & Implementation Committee, set for 3:00 p.m. on July 22.

I anticipate that the meeting may have as its goal the identification of financially feasible alternatives. To put it in other words, the goal may be to eliminate the perceived financially non-feasible alternatives from the EA. If so, Douglas County is opposed to using the FAIC process for this purpose and would ask other participants to consider the ramifications of this for themselves.

Douglas County believes that the EA should bring forth the General Purpose and Phased General Purpose alternatives. These should not be eliminated from consideration as alternatives during the upcoming FAIC meeting, for at least two reasons:

First, we as local governments should not be making important decisions affecting the future of our communities during these work sessions. We need to make these decisions deliberately and carefully during the NEPA public comment process, when a comment period of 30 days or more allows all of the affected departments and elected officials time to review and consider the material presented in the EA. This is highly technical material that we need to review with appropriate technical staff and consultants. We should not be asked to take a position, on behalf of our local governments or elected officials, on the complex subject of financial feasibility during the FAIC meeting.

Second, the FAIC process is focused on financial issues alone, as the name implies. But the NEPA process involves many other considerations which are equally important for our constituents, such as air quality impacts, induced congestion on side streets, mitigation of impacts, noise, and others. If the FAIC process makes a decision on "financially" feasible alternatives based on the financial information presented to the FAIC Committee, it risks overlooking critically important environmental and social impact information that needs to be used to decide which alternative truly serves our communities.

In conclusion, I request that the upcoming third FAIC meeting not have as its goal the elimination of any alternatives as financially unfeasible.

cc: Dennis Donald, Osprey Group
John Huyler, Osprey Group