

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2015 11:10 AM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Albrecht, Gary; Hermen, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; Lumbantobing, Sharon; Wisner, Sonja
Cc: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: Staff Comments On Councilor Madore's November 15, 2015 "proposal"

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FYI and for the record Thanks

From: Madore, David
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2015 10:48 AM
To: 'David McDonald'; McCauley, Mark; Madore, David
Cc: Horne, Chris; Cook, Christine; Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: RE: Staff Comments On Councilor Madore's November 15, 2015 "proposal"

Mr. McDonald,

Thank you for your letter that expresses your understanding in some areas and misunderstandings in other areas. Please allow me to address some of those main points.

My job description includes going to bat for the citizens to defend their rights and to advocate for their interests. Within the limits of federal and state law, including the GMA, I will advocate for a Comp Plan that complies with the GMA while preserving our environmental resources, and protects the private property rights of citizens that I am entrusted to represent.

The record of public meetings, CVTV videos, and emails clearly refute the fallacy that you express – that I do not seek, want, or welcome staff's input and help. Nothing could be further from the truth. As you heard me once again praise staff and once again invite and welcome their input last night, you are a firsthand witness of the truth.

The materials presented to our community during our these two open houses have been provided to staff ahead of time so they could prepare them for these open houses. I trust that they also equipped our Planning Commission with these same materials for their consideration.

As my numerous emails with staff convey, I have been and continue to seek their feedback and two-way dialog as part of the vetting process. As one decision maker, responsible for setting these Comp Plan policies, I continue to seek the expertise and insight from staff. Every communication is by nature, influence. It all contributes to an optimized well informed vetted policy.

There is one point that you completely misunderstand. That fallacy needs to be corrected. You asserted that my position is that our current Comp Plan does not comply with the GMA. I have not asserted any such thing. That is a straw man argument.

A straw man is a common form of argument and is an informal fallacy based on giving the impression of refuting an opponent's argument, while actually refuting an argument which was not advanced by that opponent.

My position is clearly written in the proposed assumptions presented at our open houses I quote those assumptions here.

“The choice A assumptions assert that Alternative 1 would add 18,814 new persons in the rural area which is 45% more impact than necessary since choice A forecasts a need for 12,955 new persons in the rural area ” Table 2, reference 4A.

“The choice B assumptions show that Alternative 1 can fit 8,182 new persons which is 51% too low. Thus Alternative 1 is not a viable option since it cannot comply with the GMA requirement to provide for the forecasted growth. (8,182 / 16,656)”

I welcome your feedback as you've been very involved in past Comp Plan processes and can offer valuable scrutiny. So far, your feedback has been so general that I have not been able to glean anything useful due to the complete lack of specifics. There are two tables with 8 assumptions each. They are each very specific. I invite you to provide very specific arguments focused on challenging any or all of these individual choices

As you can understand, your blanket assertion that the proposal does not comply with GMA amounts to a personal opinion that you have not supported with any logical arguments. In contrast, I believe that our proposed plans and assumptions not only comply with the GMA, but that compliance is supported by a wealth of very specific points, abundant data, ample evidence, and GIS records I invite you to help us by offering very specific arguments that may make our proposal better.

Thank you,

David Madore

From: David McDonald [<mailto:david@mcdonaldpc.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2015 8:19 AM

To: McCauley, Mark

Cc: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Horne, Chris; Cook, Christine; stevem@landerholm.com; Keltz, Mary; Orjako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon

Subject: Staff Comments On Councilor Madore's November 15, 2015 "proposal"

Mr. McCauley:

Attached please find a letter following up on last night's Open House

Please contact me if you have any questions

Best Regards,

David T McDonald