

Madore quizzed on land-use proposals

Open house on growth plan sees residents put questions to councilor

By **Katie Gillespie**, Columbian County Government Reporter
Published: November 16, 2015, 9:17 PM



An open house to discuss Clark County's growth plan update quickly turned into a question-and-answer session with county Councilor David Madore, whose involvement in the zoning proposal has been hands-on all year.



At Hockinson High School on Monday, Madore presented an edited version of Alternative 4, his own zoning proposal to Clark County's 20-year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update. Madore's proposal would allow for more subdivision in unincorporated Clark County of rural, agriculture and forest parcels than currently allowed under county code.

Madore also unveiled a newly updated set of planning assumptions, the framework by which the county's land-use proposals are set. The planning assumptions predict how much Clark County's population might expand over the next 20 years, where they'll live and how property may develop.

"I proposed another set of assumptions that to me look more likely," Madore told the audience.

Madore said his new assumptions would significantly reduce the number of lots created by both Alternative 1, which would make no changes to county zoning, and Alternative 4, the proposal he created at the urging of land use group Clark County Citizens United, while allowing for a larger population than the county approved earlier this year.

According to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the land-use alternatives, Alternative 1 could allow for the development of 7,073 new lots. Alternative 4 could create 12,401 new lots. But using Madore's assumptions and calculations, Alternative 1 should only create 3,325 new lots, while Alternative 4 should create 6,638 new lots.

Madore was peppered with questions from audience members about the proposal and where his new numbers and assumptions came from.

Kay Hudziak, who later said she's been concerned with the way the plans have been developed, asked Madore why the county is considering changing its proposals now.

Madore responded by saying it's the county's "due diligence" to go back and re-evaluate its planning assumptions and numbers to make sure they're accurate.

"The answer to that is this has been an educational process not only to you, but to us guys," Madore said.

Heidi Owens echoed Hudziak's concerns, asking how Madore's proposals have been vetted.

"We need the right methodology to really make these things work," she said.

Susan Rasmussen, president of Clark County Citizens United and a vocal proponent of Alternative 4 asked whether the revised Alternative 4 was a new alternative or an update to previous versions.

Madore denied that his updated Alternative 4 rises to the level of a new alternative, saying it is only an updated version of a previous draft.

"The reason we call them drafts is because we expect them to be revised and improved," Madore said.

Next steps

Though Madore previously said the current planning assumptions have not been "vetted," the board unanimously approved its assumptions most recently in April of this year. That resolution was an update of previous planning assumptions adopted in June 2014, updated only for a population increase of about 15,000 requested by Clark County's cities.

At a recent workshop, Councilor Tom Mielke said he supported Madore's assumptions, but the council still has to officially vote to adopt the new assumptions. That may trigger a complete overhaul of the comprehensive plan and its alternatives, planning staff have said, as the four alternatives were adopted with previous planning assumptions in mind.

The update must be completed and approved by the state Commerce Department by June 30 to comply with the state Growth Management Act. County planning staff have voiced concerns with meeting that deadline, though Madore denied that his new information has in any way put the county at risk.

"This process has not threatened, in my eyes, our schedule," Madore said.

There will be a second open house from 5:30 to 7 p.m. Tuesday at Ridgefield High School, 2630 S. Hillhurst Road.

The Clark County Planning Commission will consider Madore's proposals at 6:30 p.m. Thursday at the Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin St. in downtown Vancouver. The Planning Commission rejected an earlier version of Alternative 4 in September.

Regardless of the Planning Commission's recommendations, however, the final decision rests with the Clark County council. The council is slated to select its preferred alternative, though it also may consider changing planning assumptions, at its 10 a.m. meeting Nov. 24.

Correction, Nov. 17, 1:37 p.m.: A previous version of this story mischaracterized the legality of one of Councilor David Madore's planning assumptions. A more recent version of the example provided appears to comply with state law, according to deputy prosecutor Christine Cook. The story has been updated to remove the error.

Katie Gillespie ·

County Government Reporter at The Columbian

Hey, all,

So I've been informed by deputy prosecutor Chris Cook that there was a contextual error in my story here. I mistakenly mischaracterized whether Councilor David Madore's latest proposal was legal under the Growth Management Act based on a previous version of Madore's planning assumption proposal. I've clarified the story above to remove the error. Sorry for any misunderstanding or confusion that caused!

Katie Gillespie

Reply ·  1 · 18 hrs**Michele Wollert**

Clark County Citizens United should "fire" Madore and find another champion for their cause. He is a liability.

Reply ·  10 · 23 hrs**Ben Grobe-Heintz** ·

California Polytechnic State University

Madore's policies when viewed as a whole are nothing more than an attempt to slow growth in progressive west Clark County and ramp up growth in Republican't east Clark County. Does he care that these policies will replace the rural character of the county with lawns, fences, and jerks? Apparently not. He is trying to build a magnet for people like himself.

Reply ·  5 · Nov 17, 2015 9:19am**David Clark**

Ben Grobe-Heintz, give us a break, expanding land availability keeps housing affordable. Your position, of not expanding land, is A SURE WAY TO MAKE HOUSING UNAFFORDABLE, just like Portland has done.

Reply · 17 hrs

**Ben Grobe-Heintz** ·

California Polytechnic State University

Ha! Look at the photo folks. Does that look like affordable housing? There will be nothing affordable about the 1 acre lots Madore is trying to create. In fact, people will end up paying much more for them than they are worth, which is nothing. I would rather live in a tent in front of Share house.

Reply · 17 hrs

**David Clark**

Ben Grobe-Heintz, why do you deny basic economics of supply & demand?

Reply · 14 hrs

**Bob Burda** ·

Brush Prairie, Washington

Always remember that Madore is firmly in the developers court. Financially and morally. So if you want to get handed a bag full of higher taxes as a result of overcrowded schools, roads and infrastructure he's your guy! Sellout is a term that comes to mind when I think of this California based businessman and his intent in Clark county. Maybe that's why Don Benton is head environmentist. Imagine that!!

Reply ·  10 · Nov 17, 2015 8:52am

**Loren Lee**

"Men are so simple of mind, and so much dominated by their immediate needs, that a deceitful man will always find plenty who are ready to be deceived." Machiavelli

Reply · 4 · 16 hrs · Edited

**Ed Rutledge**

Salem, Oregon

Loren Lee Eddy's Second Rule of Public Policy:

In a semi-democratic representative society where information is ubiquitous, the depth of the collective stupidity of the masses is nevertheless immeasurable.

Reply · 2 · 20 hrs

**David Clark**

Bob Burda ---- So if you want to get handed a bag full of higher taxes as a result of overcrowded schools, roads and infrastructure he's your guy!
ME — WHAT?? Crowding people into one small area is how you get overcrowding and high costs - just look at what Portland has done with its nutty land use restrictions.

Bob Burda ---- Sellout is a term that comes to mind when I think of this California based businessman and his intent in Clark county.

ME — Please show that Madore is "California based". Why do you have a problem with a business man that employs over 100 people at family wage jobs and give free rent to 30+ charities?

Bob Burda ---- Maybe that's why Don Benton is head environmentist. Imagine that!!

ME — Do you have a problem with a guy that puts people's well being first?

Reply · 17 hrs

**Lorretta Thomas**

"This conclusion is contrary to law," read the note from the prosecuting attorney's office.

Exactly!

Reply · 11 · Nov 17, 2015 8:48am

**Michele Wollert**

Madore is handing the legal team that will fight his preferred alternative a big fat gift with every word he writes and utters in support of it. He's ignoring process again and ignoring law. He is directing staff to withhold information from the public. Mr. Transparency. Mr. Responsible Government. This plot is so whackadoo, I'd never believe it if I saw it unfold in a movie. But it's our plot, very real, and we are going to have to pay for it.

Reply · 10 · Nov 17, 2015 8:40am

**Ed Rutledge**

Salem, Oregon

The all powerful Yahweh has blessed Councilor Madore with Truth ... and a stupid lapel pin ... Clark County should not care about Madore's proposals being unlawful. It is only a couple more fines Clark County taxpayers will end up paying for Councilor Madore's Truth-driven leadership. Next up - because he tells only the truth - will be the ground-braking for Madore's Third Bridge that will have NO tolls, NO fees and NO new taxes and will not cost anyone anything. Its only 38 months away!

IGWT!!!

Reply ·  6 · Nov 17, 2015 9:35am · Edited



Lynn Carman ·

Felida, Washington

Another 'Clark County Done Deal!' This isn't planning it's just more thumbing noses to WA State on their GMA requirements so we can grow bigger and think we will have more power here?? More 'Mega Mansions' in the rural area is what was stated from Madore and Mielke.

Reply ·  9 · Nov 17, 2015 7:41am



David Clark

Keep in mind that most planners are trying to force people into their utopian vision of the ideal society and simply don't care about what people need or want. They have destroyed housing affordability in city after city with their restrictions on land availability.

See <http://www.debunkingportland.com/plans.html> and <http://www.debunkingportland.com/housing.html>

Further the current plan is far more restrictive than state law requires because it was written by extreme environmentalists and simply rubber stamped by planners and the county commissioners.

The battle over plans is actually a battle over those who would dictate that all people live in congested, expensive, high cost, dense cities and those who want low cost land for low cost housing available to accommodate population increases. Do you want your children to be able to afford a house? Then there had better be affordable land available for them. That is the crux of the battle: The "Friends of ..(insert city, county, or state here)...." don't want affordable housing - they want everyone jammed into high cost, high density cities to enrich the city's downtown mafia who expect to make lots of money from increased land values, while the ordinary people need affordable housing.

Reply ·  2 · Nov 17, 2015 5:20am · Edited



Mike Yancey ·

Clark College -- Vancouver, Washington

This should wait until the new councilers are seated and all 5 of them can vote on it.

Reply ·  6 · Nov 17, 2015 6:23am



Ben Grobe-Heintz ·

California Polytechnic State University

"Keep in mind that most planners are trying to force people into their utopian vision of the ideal society and simply don't care about what people need or want."

No David, that is exactly what Clark County Republicans led by the likes of Berrigan, Ley, and Madore have been doing in a demonstrable way.

Reply ·  7 · Nov 17, 2015 9:23am



Steve Lappier ·

Ridgefield High School

Once again, planners are evil utopians who really want to destroy everyone's way of life. Except theirs. Sure David. None of them have any type of family or loyalty to their community, they're just on a power trip to destroy the American Way of Life. Good thing the guy with all the ties to developers is here to save us. Snark off.

Reply ·  6 · 23 hrs



David Clark

Ben Grobe-Heintz --- "No David, that is exactly what Clark County Republicans led by the likes of Berrigan, Ley, and Madore have been doing in a demonstrable way."

ME-- Lets see some proof of that claim.

In the meantime you might read what some experts say about planners and housing costs: Nobel Economist on zoning driving up housing costs: <http://www.nytimes.com/.../opinion/that-hissing-sound.html>

Here is what Grist said about planning increasing housing costs: "Haifang Huang and Yao Tang, of the University of Alberta and Bowdoin College respectively, found that any limits on where homes can be built — be they lakes and mountains or urban growth boundaries such as Portland's — corresponded to both higher price gains and steeper price drops for residential property:" <http://grist.org/.../2010-07-28-smart-growth-is-great.../>

Here is a former Clark County planner saying that the city that planners idolize is run by fascists:

"Mayor Sam Adams said about this incident that "This is a city and a state that prides itself on, you know, clean government." That is not true. These people are morally bankrupt ideologues. To say they are socialists would be to underestimate them. I am fine with socialists and capitalists. These people are fascists. They force you to do their bidding." <http://www.debunkingportland.com/former-member-of...>

That was about Portland, but that is how planners HAVE TO OPERATE because the people do not support higher housing costs and prefer to live in houses not apartments and prefer cars to transit. Planners want people herded into high density instead of the dreaded sprawl, where costs are lower, crime is lower and schools better.

Are you really in favor of forcing people to live in costly high density instead of affordable house? That is really what is going on here - can your children afford to buy a house near you, or must they move miles away as is the case in Portland.

Reply 18 hrs



David Clark

Steve Lappier ----Once again, planners are evil utopians who really want to destroy everyones way of life. Except theirs.

ME — That is pretty much correct, except they are too wrapped up in their utopian theories to realize what they are doing. The falsely think high density will lower housing costs. It DOES NOT, It makes housing unaffordable. Look at what the planners have done to . . . Portland: Driven out affordable housing, crappy schools, high crime, congested roads. This is all the result of decisions by planners. They get their way by lying to the elected officials. Like David just uncovered in Clark County. Like planners did to push the CRC.

They falsely think that mass transit solves traffic congestion. It does not - in city after city, spending on transit instead of roads correlates with increased congestion.

Steve Lappier ---- Sure David. None of them have any type of family or loyalty to their community,

ME — They are deluded. They think they are doing good, but are too stupid to realize the damage they are doing and actually believe that congestion is good, that people must be forced to live a good life of transit, high density living and they are simply unable to understand that they are making housing unaffordable. Many of the top planners live in low density, but think others should live in high density.

Steve Lappier ---- Good thing the guy with all the ties to developers is here to save us. Snark off.

ME — Why do you dislike the people who build homes for people to live in? Did you build your hous with your own hands? Or was it built by a developer?

BTW there are two distinct types of housing developers:

- 1) those who build houses for people to buy. They must build what people want in order to sell and are therefore very close to their customers. They know people want back yards, and some degree of privacy.
- 2) Those who seek government subsidies to build apartments. They have little need to care about people and must submit to the crazy ideas of government planners to get their favors.

If you are against allowing more land for housing YOU ARE FOR UNAFFORDABLE HOUSING. That is simply basic economics, proven time after time.

Reply · 16 hrs · Edited



Richard Bullington ·

Aspiring Genealogist at Retired

David Clark.

Yes, yes, yes, yes, YES! You are right that limits on land availability drive up housing prices. We GET it! But maybe we don't think that cheap housing is the sole and ultimate good in life. Ever think about that? One person's 4000 square foot piece of heaven is another person's burden "that I have to clean!"

You want cheap housing? Go to Omaha. Or Des Moines. Or Wichita. All of them have healthy economies and super-cheap housing. You can buy a three-bedroom rambler twenty years old for right around \$100K in any of them. Cheap housing!

But, you say, "I love the Northwest! It's beautiful and those other places are flat and boring. And hot!"

Well then, if you "love the Northwest" don't be so quick to screw it up! Either align with the dominant culture here which values a clean and peaceful environment more than most other parts of the country do or consider going where the dominant culture agrees with you.

The truth is that if you own your current home you can turn it into something nearly twice as big or twice as nice in one of those cities. That's what David and lemmings who have followed him here did. Why not take the plunge?

Reply · 1 · 9 hrs · Edited



Bridget McLeman

It's called selling a pig in a poke.

Reply · 7 · Nov 17, 2015 1:14am



Jennifer Barnes

This is a HOT mess.

Reply · 7 · Nov 16, 2015 11:44pm