

**Schroader, Kathy**



**From:** Steven Nelson <kumtux@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 24, 2015 11:45 AM  
**To:** Cnty 2016 Comp Plan  
**Subject:** Council Vote on Alternative Alternative 4 and Alternative Planning Assumptions

Greetings

I read The Columbian this morning and a wave of nausea struck as I saw the intention of the County Council to approve the new alternative 4 and new so-called planning assumptions at today's meeting. Chairman Madore, apparently, is going to get his way no matter what! Although he makes this stuff up as he goes, he has two-thirds majority vote on the council, so he can basically do anything he pleases. I want to very firmly express my objections as a life long rural resident of Clark County and ATFS certified timber owner, that true forest and farm landowners do NOT want rezoning of these lands to allow for smaller lot sizes to be developed. It is the number one threat to these lands--not fire, not disease, not clear cutting, but rather development. It will also affect the landowner tax base by increasing the value of these lands, whether they are sheltered by current ag and forest property tax alternatives or not. As a developer, Mr. Madore has clear self-serving motives to accomplish this move before the new Charter structure takes effect. So that's my first objection-- Alternative 4, 4A, 4B, what ever he wishes to call it is wrong and not in the interests of growth management and the citizens of Clark County.

My second objection is Mr. Madore's absolute gall in creation of new planning assumptions unencumbered by actual facts, because he knows better than any professional planners, land use professionals, environmental attorneys or state policy experts. My God he must have an ego of absolute self-importance. Of course, the planning commission and I both know that this will never pass muster in the state approval process. That may be the one saving grace. He wasn't around for the long, drawn out process that it took to get final approval of the original plan some 20 year's ago. Both his assumptions and Alternative 4X don't comply with the substance or processes prescribed by the WGMA.

And that brings me to my final objection-- due process and due diligence. I don't understand how Mr. Madore can claim due diligence as the basis for unilaterally proposing a capricious plan without the benefit of either citizen or professional input. As the county planning commission well knows, there is both a process and standards by which a comprehensive growth management plan unfolds. It isn't done by one person, on his own, while changing assumptions to match his vision of an alternative future reality. I smell a big law suit coming over this. If there is a class action law suit, I am ready to join up. But I think that State of Washington has a little more leverage than I do, so I'll let them sue the County first. In the mean time, (aside from growth management planning), Mr. Madore might not want to cut next year's county budget just yet, because the legal bills and added burden that will be placed on both the County attorneys and planners is going to be enormous. By then he will be long gone, having left us all with a big mess and failure to comply.

With that I say, well, Happy Thanksgiving!

Steven Nelson  
24923 NE Westerholm Road  
Brush Prairie, WA 98606

360-256-2846

---

*Ah, make the most of what we may yet spend,  
before we too into Dust descend,  
Dust into Dust, and under Dust, to lie,  
Sans Wine, sans Song, sans Singer, and—sans End!*