

From: [Oliver Orjiako](#)
To: [Jeffrey Delapena](#)
Subject: FW: CONVERSATION WITH PLANNING DIRECTOR REGARDING CAMAS PLANNING DEFICIENCIES
Date: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:08:20 AM
Attachments: [PastedGraphic-1.png](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Hi Jeff,

As FYI. Thanks.



OLIVER ORJIAKO
Director
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.2280



From: Randal Friedman <randalfriedman@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 19, 2025 6:09 PM
To: Sue Marshall <Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; Jenna Kay <Jenna.Kay@clark.wa.gov>; Heidi Cody <heidi@waconservationaction.org>; Don Steinke <crvancouversa@gmail.com>; Steve Hogan <shogan@cityofcamas.us>; council@cityofcamas.us; Alan Peters <APeters@cityofcamas.us>; David Stuebe <David.Stuebe@cityofwashougal.us>
Subject: CONVERSATION WITH PLANNING DIRECTOR REGARDING CAMAS PLANNING DEFICIENCIES

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Chair Marshall — Friday afternoon Heidi, Don and myself had a wonderful discussion with Oliver Orjiako, the county's Planning Director. We talked of many county land use issues and how Camas is considered with a wider lens. Oliver was forthright about some issues and great conversation ensued. Oliver seemed surprised to learn of the deficiencies in Camas' public participation process. We discussed at length the treatment of indirect impacts and alternatives required under SEPA.

Jenna explained that within Alternative 3, most proposed additions result in climate friendly infill development furthering sustainability. I learned that the impact analysis of Camas' request, at the County's level of analysis, makes Camas' proposal seem SEPA compliant. The County's analysis lacks a substantial impacts analysis to climate change, traffic, resource depletion, and deviation from what the State of Washington seeks through the GMA. These were not considered at this level nor by the City of Camas and would not meet SEPA scrutiny.

Oliver was not aware that the city's June preferred land use plan on record does not include nor mention the City's Alternative 3 request. There has been no opportunity for public discussion in the process. I checked further and found the nearly one-year old "official" alternative also made this UGA proposed addition invisible. We shouldn't plan, or seek SEPA compliance, with invisible ink.

Oliver and Jenna encouraged the three of us to make comments to the DEIS. I will draft suggestions that speak to the indirect impacts to SW Washington from Camas's Alternative 3 request. Comments will also mention the deficiency of GMA/SEPA consideration of a Mill District as an alternative for this twenty year plan. The comment will speak to public participation deficiencies.

I will not speak for Heidi or Don or any organization I am affiliated with. Alternative 3's Camas request flies in the face of GMA and SEPA fundamentals. It violates the foundational role of required public participation and the full consideration of impacts, including indirect, over the next 20 years. I've attached an admittedly crude example of reasonably foreseeable impacts through growth inducement.

The mood in Camas? I've spoken to people and they shrug their shoulders like this massive growth is inevitable. I hope the County can listen and do better.

We are a community that has not been listened to and beaten down. Most have retreated from involvement. What's the point?

The GMA exists to remove the inevitably of this last minute effort to extend urbanization into the rural landscape and make informed decisions based on public involvement the city listens to. Boundaries have meaning.

I look forward to the County’s independent review of these issues and will provide comments. I may come visit the council as well.

Thank you for representing Camas’ community as Council Chair and ensuring our voices are heard.

Randal Friedman

Camas, WA

