

**Schroader, Kathy**



**From:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 11, 2016 8 04 AM  
**To:** Albrecht, Gary, Alvarez, Jose, Anderson, Colete, Euler, Gordon, Hermen, Matt, Kamp, Jacqueline, Lebowsky, Laurie, Lumbantobing, Sharon, Orjiako, Oliver, Schroader, Kathy, Wiser, Sonja  
**Subject:** FW Comment on Growth Management Plan  
**Attachments:** Appearance of Fairness Documents docx

FYI and for the record Thanks

**From:** Bridget McLeman [<mailto:bridget.mcleman@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2016 7:48 PM  
**To:** McCauley, Mark; Orjiako, Oliver  
**Subject:** Comment on Growth Management Plan

I have submitted the attached document on the engage Clark County web based comment forum I am uncertain as to which category it fits so I thought I would duplicate the entry by emailing a copy to you I did not add my name to it - though I'm quite happy to do so if you think it matters It is a general comment on the principle of 'appearance of fairness' and the undue influence of specific parties in the process rendering an unbiased decision impossible If there is a better place to submit it - please let me know

I attach this for the public record

Thank you

Bridget McLeman

## "Appearance of fairness"

It is not clear where where it is appropriate to place my comments on the public record on the development of Clark County's Growth Management plan. It seems clear on the review of the record, the public testimony, and the content of Clark County Public Record Requests for emails etc. through the lengthy GMA process that one Councilor has not taken an objective stance in listening and addressing the information presented to Council. Instead, there is a pattern of undue influence of one particular group and the ignoring of all other citizen opinion, data, and comment.

While the doctrine of "Appearance of Fairness" (<http://mrsc.org/Home/Explore-Topics/Legal/General-Government/The-Appearance-of-Fairness-Doctrine.aspx>) establishes rules for avoidance of bias in decisions connected to land management issues, it does not, typically, relate to Council member's process of policy adoption connected to the Growth Management Plan. However, in the case of the development of various alternatives in the case of Clark County's comprehensive plan, certain council members have strayed from policy into policy implementation by both developing an alternative and identifying the ways in which a new GMP would be implemented.

Without going into the practical and technical steps one Councilor took in developing the plan, what follows are some specific examples of the bias, the evidence of one lobby group driving the process, and one councilor advocating his particular view of policy implementation.

Mr. Madore has also moved beyond the status of policy maker as is clear to multiple references to working on data himself, developing algorithms for use by GIS staff, and giving specific implementation criteria with directions to Community Planning staff not to comment, change or introduce any other material. This aspect of Mr. Madore's intervention is documented elsewhere but is accessible in a number of Public Records Requests at <https://www.clark.wa.gov/councilors/public-records-request>

The other aspect of Mr. Madore's violation of the 'appearance of fairness' criteria relates to the closeness of his working relationship with one group representing one element of rural citizens to the exclusion of listening to any other perspectives. He has eliminated any perception that he could objectively listen to citizen comment and to choose among policy alternatives and implementation practices. He has clearly established too close a connection with the officers of the Clark County Citizens United lobby group to be objective. The two spokespersons have a total right to testify, as they have, weekly on their particular position however both have worked many hours and days in the Councilor's office to the extent that they made themselves at home using staff facilities such as refrigerator, lunch room etc.

What follows are random examples of the influence of CCCU over the development of Alternate 4 for the next Growth Management Plan, its components and its process.

1. Planning Process: Significant influence of legal adviser for Clark County Citizens United (CCCU) in direct contact with Councilor Madore in 'giving instructions' to Planning staff.

Note: Mr. Madore met public record requirements by forwarding certain emails from his private email address to his county email address. (No attempt made to verify all emails forwarded).

Exchange of e-mails David Madore collaboration with Donald McIsaac, lawyer for CCCU, driving the development of the process for adoption of Alternative 4, an alternative presented by Mr. Madore but clearly developed in collaboration with Mr. Silliman and Mr. McIsaac.

From: DONALD MCISAAC [<mailto:donalddmcsaac@msn.com>]

Sent: Sunday, February 01, 2015 9:11 AM

To: Orjiako, Oliver

Cc: McCauley, Mark; Silliman, Peter; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Madore, David

Subject: Alternative 4 Process and Schedule

Oliver,

Thank you for the prompt response.

If Thursday, February 5 from 10-11 is still open on your calendar please pencil me in to meet at that time.

Thank you also for provided the written description detail on Alternative 2; this gives an idea of the detail threshold needed for Alternative 4 descriptions. Regarding the descriptions of the rural components of Alternative 2, there are references to changing the millennium lot size in "some" R areas; elsewhere there are references to A, F, and R changes "as appropriate". Is there anything in writing, as opposed to a map display, on how the "some" or "as appropriate" are described?

I committed to sending you my thoughts on further process and schedule beyond the current pause in the process to consider an alternative 4 for rural areas. Please see attached for further discussion when we meet.

Please advise on the acceptability of the Thursday meeting time,

Don

From: [Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov)

To: [donalddmcsaac@msn.com](mailto:donalddmcsaac@msn.com)

CC: [Mark.McCauley@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Mark.McCauley@clark.wa.gov); [Peter.Silliman@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Peter.Silliman@clark.wa.gov); [Tom.Mielke@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Tom.Mielke@clark.wa.gov);

[Jeanne.Stewart@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Jeanne.Stewart@clark.wa.gov); [David.Madore@clark.wa.gov](mailto:David.Madore@clark.wa.gov); [Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov)

Subject: RE: Alternative 4 Process and Schedule

Date: Tue, 3 Feb 2015 01:03:07 +0000

Hello Don:

Staff proposal is reduce the minimum parcel size from Rural- 20 to R-10 to maintain buffering of resource land as required by GMA. We have identified areas that the proposal will apply and it is better to see that on a map. It appears that it will be a two-step process. We do not have a written document on the proposal. It is just that. The idea is that if as proposed, the current AG-20 will become AG-10. A minimum parcel size of 10 acres. It will not require a Rural -20 to buffer AG-10.

Yes, I will put you down at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday. At some point we need to engage the public on the development of Alternative 4. Please, let me know if you have questions. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Oliver

From: DONALD MCISAAC [<mailto:donaldmcisaac@msn.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, February 03, 2015 8:07 AM

To: Orjiako, Oliver

Cc: McCauley, Mark; Silliman, Peter; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Madore, David; Euler, Gordon

Subject: RE: Alternative 4 Process and Schedule

Oliver,

Thanks for the response. I presume a written description of how the particular parcels were selected for Alternative 2, and how others were not, can be forthcoming at some point-- perhaps in the draft SEIS if not prior.

I agree with you on the need to engage the public at some point on the development of Alternative 4. In the Process and Schedule document sent in the earlier email, it would start with a briefing of the Councilors at a work session next Wednesday, February 11. While that would not be a decision-making meeting of the BOCC, it is a public meeting where the public would get first exposure to Alternative 4 ideas. After receiving guidance from the Councilors as to what should be put out for public comment on a draft Alternative 4, the proposed schedule calls for release of the draft Alternative 4 ideas by February 17 followed by a public hearing or town hall meeting on February 26.

I look forward to talking with you Thursday at 10 about the process and schedule. Please let me know if you have different thoughts on formal engagement of the public.

I meet with Peter on Thursday mid-day, where we hope to agree on Alternative 4 features and elements that could be analyzed in the SEIS, as per the January 21 work session direction.

If there are advance arrangements that need to be done to set the February 11 work session meeting agenda, please make room for to allow this.

Thanks,

Don

---

From: Orjiako, Oliver

To: "DONALD MCISAAC"

Cc: McCauley, Mark; Silliman, Peter; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Madore, David; Euler, Gordon; Cook, Christine;

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

Subject: RE: Alternative 4 Process and Schedule

Date: Tuesday, February 03, 2015 10:38:19 AM

Good morning Don:

Thanks for your email. We have a schedule and a public participation process which we have been following. Staff will adjust our schedule and timeline for completion of the 2016 plan update as soon as there is a decision/direction from the BOCC on a proposed 4th Alternative. There is a pause in the process per the BOCC directive at the January 21, 2015 work session until a new alternative 4 is developed.

I am reviewing your proposed schedule and process expectation and will share my thoughts when we meet on Thursday. We have a good working relationship with the Board's Office and BOCC on scheduling work session related to the plan update. I am not aware of a February 11 work session. I am seeking PA's council on the level of public involvement in the development of alternative 4 since it is outside of the SEIS Scoping process to date.

I need more information regarding your question on how a particular parcel were selected for Alternative 2 and not others. We will discuss this further on Thursday and also clarify your

assertion that the public had not seen the staff recommended range of alternatives nor the content of alternative 2 prior to October 22. If you have questions, please call me.  
Best Regards,  
Oliver

---

2 Undue Influence Clark County Citizens' United involvement in policy development, directing development, influencing outcomes

Example Multiple emails (sample below) from Susan Rasmussen and Carol Levanen – primary leaders of Clark County Citizen's United to council member Madore requesting inclusion of information in the Comprehensive Plan

From susan rasmussen  
To Madore, David  
Subject Reader  
Date Tuesday, September 01, 2015 2:32:35 PM  
Please be so kind as to include this as a resource document for the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update  
[http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/comp\\_plan/documents/final\\_ag\\_analysis\\_prelim\\_report.pdf](http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/comp_plan/documents/final_ag_analysis_prelim_report.pdf)  
Sent from Windows Mail

---

Example Multiple emails insisting on removal of Healthy communities report and resource references on first, the CC Public Health web site and, then, in the Comprehensive Plan and attachments

From Carol Levanen [cndental@yahoo.com]  
To David Madore [David.Madore@usdigital.com]  
Subject Growing Healthy Report - Comm Planning - Health Department - continued agenda  
Sent 1 Sep 2015 21:08:44 +0000

The videos are gone, but the report is still there

2016 Comprehensive Growth management Plan update - Community Planning - Clark County, Washington

<<http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/documents.html>>  
<

[http://www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/about/documents/fsc/fsc\\_framework.pdf](http://www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/about/documents/fsc/fsc_framework.pdf)  
<http://www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/food/documents/FSCapplicationform2013.pdf>  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YEGHT4F3gcY&feature=youtu.be>

---

From Carol Levanen  
To McCauley, Mark, Orjiako, Oliver  
Subject Fw: Documents - Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Community Planning  
Date Thursday, September 03, 2015 11:53:13 AM

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>  
To: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>; "jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov" <jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov>; "david.madore@clark.wa.gov" <david.madore@clark.wa.gov>; "tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov" <tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov>; Jim Malinowski <j.malinowski@ieee.org>  
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2015 11:08 AM  
Subject: Documents - Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Community Planning

Dear Councilors,  
Listed as one of the Elements of the Comprehensive Plan is the "Growing Healthier Report." This report is also one of three, along with the "Aging Readiness" report, that is listed as resources for the comprehensive plan. I recall that the Board did not authorize this; but the reports are there.

Sincerely, Susan Rasmussen  
[http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/comp\\_plan/docs.html](http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/comp_plan/docs.html)  
Sent from Windows Mail

---

From: Carol Levanen  
To: Stewart, Jeanne; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Orjiako, Oliver; McCauley, Mark  
Subject: Fw: Clark County Food Systems Council - A special interest political group - For the Record  
Date: Thursday, September 03, 2015 11:57:02 AM

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>  
To: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2015 10:54 AM  
Subject: Reader  
Strategies for change, Food Systems Council  
<http://www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/about/documents/RoadmapWorkPlan2012.pdf>  
Sent from Windows Mail

From: Carol Levanen  
To: Stewart, Jeanne; Madore, David; tpm.mielke@clark.wa.gov; cnldental@yahoo.com  
Subject: Fw: 2012 Clark County Food Systems Council on clark.wa.gov website  
Date: Thursday, September 03, 2015 11:02:37 PM  
What did it cost the public to produce this glitzy advertisement for this political environmental group?  
Did staff compose it? Who authorized it?

---

From: Madore, David  
To: Carol Levanen  
Subject: Fwd: Food Systems Council - Clark County - For the Public Record  
Date: Friday, September 04, 2015 7:16:57 AM

Carol,  
The removal of the file that you mention in you other latest email, may have been removed in response to this email yesterday.

David Madore

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Madore, David" <David.Madore@clark.wa.gov>  
Date: September 3, 2015 at 4:25:01 PM PDT  
To: "Melnick, Alan" <Alan.Melnick@clark.wa.gov>, "Madore, David" <David.Madore@clark.wa.gov>  
Subject: FW: Food Systems Council - Clark County - For the Public Record  
Dr. Alan Melnick,  
There is yet one more case where Clark County public resources are being used to advocate for a one-sided political agenda. The Clark County Food System Council, formed using public grant funds in 2007, has morphed into an organization that has linked up with entities that have litigated against Clark County, such a Futurewise (<http://futurewise.org/>), while excluding organizations that hold a different view such as Clark County Citizens United (CCCU).  
The latest example is the Land use Forum, held at the Vancouver Library on August 31, 2015 that advocated against Alternative 4. An audio recording of that meeting is here:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZeYiwbl77fU&feature=youtu.be>  
The primary purpose of their current activity is to advocate against alternatives 2 and 4. An example of their advocacy starts at the 44:00 marker of the video. The invited presenters, partners, and speakers universally oppose our proposed comp plan update alternatives.  
Because this organization is sponsored by Clark County Public Health, our staff has also been joined in the advocacy and spends funds on travel and lodging to advocate at events in other areas. Here is an example:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YEGHT4F3gcY&feature=youtu.be>  
Many of the projects and influence of this organization and others are healthy and good.  
We certainly welcome the community and various organizations to advocate for political agendas. However, these political advocacy activities must not use taxpayer funds, nor use Clark County Public health resources.  
Please let me know what we need to do to disconnect this organization from Clark County Public Health.  
Thank you,  
David Madore

---

From: Melnick, Alan  
To: Madore, David  
Cc: McCauley, Mark  
Subject: RE: Food Systems Council - Clark County - For the Public Record  
Date: Friday, September 04, 2015 2:02:42 PM  
Dear Councilor Madore,  
Clark County Public Health did not participate in the Land Use Forum on August 31. As we discussed a couple of days ago, we provide information for the Food System Council and

other community groups regarding research evidence about the association between environmental factors, natural and manmade, and public health. We do so, because, as you note, many of the FSC projects, as well as projects other community organizations engage in, are healthy and good.

The video has been removed from You Tube.

Best regards,

Alan

Alan Melnick, MD, MPH, CPH | Public Health Director/Health Officer

Clark County Public Health

1601 E. Fourth Plain Blvd., Bldg. 17, 3rd Floor

P.O. Box 9825, Vancouver, WA 98666-8825

(360) 397-8412

---

From: Madore, David

Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 2:25 PM

To: Melnick, Alan

Subject: old website docs

Dr. Alan Melnick,

There is another cluster of documents remaining our Public health website that continue to advocate against growing local healthy food and rural property owners. It pushes hyper density in inner cities and wars against rural lifestyles with false assumptions.

Here's an excerpt from page 13 of the "Health Element Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Growing Healthier" document:

"People in rural areas have unequal access to healthy foods. Emerging research in the US has revealed a disparity in food price and quality by geography. Populations living in rural areas often must travel longer distances to access full-service grocery stores. Controlling for population density, one study found that rural areas have fewer food retailers of any kind compared to urban areas. A US Department of Agriculture report also found higher food prices in rural areas which typically have smaller food retail establishments."

[http://www.clark.wa.gov/publichealth/community/growing\\_healthy/documents/FoodLitReviewCurrentConditions.pdf](http://www.clark.wa.gov/publichealth/community/growing_healthy/documents/FoodLitReviewCurrentConditions.pdf)

It appears that virtually all of the documents and links on this page push the same agenda.

Some citizens refer to such activism as social engineering and Agenda 21.

[http://www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/community/growing\\_healthy/documents.html](http://www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/community/growing_healthy/documents.html)

As the BOCC has communicated in our Comp Plan Update work sessions, such documents do not belong in the comp plan.

Thank you for helping us to clean up our county website.

David

---

From: Madore, David

To: Melnick, Alan

Cc: McCauley, Mark; Horne, Chris

Subject: Re: old website docs

Date: Sunday, September 20, 2015 9:12:43 AM

Dr Alan Melnick,

Thank you for the very informative response. I fully embrace the necessity to follow a public process to amend or repeal any policy that was formally adopted previously.



As our board shared in our last comp plan work session, our intent is to only include the GMA required documents in our comp plan. I will add this to a list of extracurricular documents that we can consider removing.

As always, your help is outstanding and very much appreciated.

David Madore

On Sep 18, 2015, at 11:09 AM, Melnick, Alan <Alan.Melnick@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

Dear Councilor Madore,

In 2012, the Board of County Commissioners voted 3-0 to adopt the Growing Healthier Report and directed that it be folded into the County Comprehensive Plan. The Public Health Advisory Council championed the development of the Growing Healthier Report, which included a thorough scientific literature review and comprehensive community engagement, including public meetings, public presentations and extensive efforts to get community feedback. I believe there was broad community support, including, but not limited to, support from hospital and health system partners and local healthcare providers. The Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend that the Board of Commissioner adopt the Growing Healthier Report.

I understand and appreciate your concerns that the report pushes an agenda that supports high density while disparaging rural living. My understanding of the report is that it relies on the best available science to provide a flexible tool that the Board can use in prioritizing strategies based on consideration of potential health impacts. I consulted with the Prosecuting Attorney's Office and understand that the Growing Healthier Report is an adopted document in the Comprehensive Plan until the Board modifies the Comprehensive Plan to remove it. As such, I have reservations about removing the Growing Healthier Report from our website. Since we are reviewing our on-line content in a comprehensive manner, I'm hopeful that rather than taking a piecemeal approach to removing information and documents from on our website that we can work with the County Prosecuting Attorney's Office in a comprehensive review of what needs to remain and what can be removed from our site.

Best regards,

Alan

Alan Melnick, MD, MPH, CPH | Public Health Director/Health Officer

Clark County Public Health

1601 E. Fourth Plain Blvd., Bldg. 17, 3rd Floor

P.O. Box 9825, Vancouver, WA 98666-8825

(360) 397-8412

Web | Facebook | Twitter

Public Health – Always working for a safer and healthier community

---

From: "Orjiako, Oliver" <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>

To: "Carol Levanen (cnldental@yahoo.com)" <cnldental@yahoo.com>

Cc: "Euler, Gordon" <Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov>; "Alvarez, Jose"

<Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>;

"Schroader, Kathy" <Kathy.Schroader@clark.wa.gov>

Sent: Monday, September 21, 2015 4:18 PM

update Most disturbing is the fact that planning staff have disregarded the directives of the Councilors This is the prime issue of concern  
Thank you for your attention,  
Susan Rasmussen for  
Clark County Citizens United, Inc  
Sent from Windows Mail

---

From Orjiako, Oliver  
To "susan rasmussen", Carol Levanen, Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose, Anderson, Colete  
Cc Stewart, Jeanne, Mielke, Tom, Madore, David, McCauley, Mark, DONALD MCISAAC  
Subject RE Ignoring directives from the Councilors  
Date Tuesday, September 22, 2015 8:36:23 AM

Good morning Susan  
Thank you for your email and concerns expressed We are following directives from the Board of County Councilors I will review the work sessions you mentioned I will stress that it is staff responsibility to make sure that the councilors are made aware of the requirements of GMA Our role include making sure that our update include recent amendments to the GMA  
I provided the sections below to Carol following a brief discussion with her on September 17, 2015 at the PC deliberation I am including it here in my reply to you It is important to note that deference to local governments does not mean developing a growth management plan that is inconsistent with the Growth Management Act

At the PC deliberation meeting we briefly talk about some language in the RCW 36 70A (GMA) and other new related changes As you read RCW 36 70A 070 (1), you will find the following " Wherever possible, the land use element should consider utilizing urban planning approaches that promote physical activity"  
Section RCW 36 70A 070 (6)(a)(vii) says "Pedestrian and bicycle component to include collaborative efforts to identify and designate planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles"  
Feel free to review ESSB 5186 and 2SHB 1565 If you have questions, please let me know  
Best Regards,  
Oliver

---

From susan rasmussen  
To Orjiako, Oliver, Carol Levanen, Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose, Anderson, Colete  
Cc Stewart, Jeanne, Mielke, Tom, Madore, David, McCauley, Mark, DONALD MCISAAC, Jim Malinowski, Jerry Olson,  
Clark County Citizens United Inc , Rick Dunning, Fred Pickering, lorettajsteele@gmail com  
Subject Re Who is responsible for ensuring oversight?  
Date Tuesday, September 22, 2015 9:11:40 AM  
Good morning Oliver,  
I've reread the particular section of the RCW, and it is not a mandatory element of the GMA  
What is inconsistent with the GMA is not lending recognition to the policies set down by the

Subject RCW 36 70A 070

Hello Carol

At the PC deliberation meeting we briefly talk about some language in the RCW 36 70A (GMA) and other new related changes As you read RCW 36 70A 070 (1), you will find the following " Wherever possible, the land use element should consider utilizing urban planning approaches that promote physical activity"

Section RCW 36 70A 070 (6)(a)(vii) says "Pedestrian and bicycle component to include collaborative efforts to identify and designate planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles"

Feel free to review ESSB 5186 and 2SHB 1565 If you have questions, please let me know

Best Regards,  
Oliver

---

From Carol Levanen

Sent Monday , September 21 , 2015 8 55 PM

To Orjiako, Oliver

Hello Oliver, Thanks for the info What I was concerned about was the healthy food language that is proposed for the Comprehensive Plan I don't believe it is a mandate of the GMA and I don't believe it should be used as a means to lock up rural and resource lands into large lot zoning I did find a WAC that I think we did discuss, but it simply says may consider, and there is no directive to that passage We are very alarmed that the Health Department has been incorporated into the comp plan in such a way as to attempt to accomplish an environmental and no growth agenda This is not planning, it is social engineering Please try not to do that in the 2016 update of the Plan Thanks!

Best Regards, Carol Levanen, Ex Secretary, CCCU, Inc

---

From susan rasmussen [<mailto:sprazz@outlook.com>]

Sent Tuesday, September 22, 2015 7 03 AM

To Orjiako, Oliver, Carol Levanen

Cc Stewart, Jeanne, Mielke, Tom, Madore, David, McCauley, Mark, DONALD MCISAAC

Subject Re Ignoring directives from the Councilors

Dear Oliver and Carol,

We are at odds over interpretation of the GMA here Without doubt, the GMA is distinctly clear that local discretion should be advanced, and the policies set down by the policy makers, (the elected officials) need to be recognized, honored and implemented In this case, staff has been disregarding what the policy makers have clearly stated

Please be so kind as to recall the work session with the Clark County Board of Councilors and the planning staff held mid July Oliver, you weren't in attendance but you still should access the recording of the minutes to listen to the tone of this particular work session Gordy Euler presented the two reports One was the Growing Healthier Report, and the other was the report on aging His obvious intent was to include them in the 2016 comprehensive plan update

However, the Board of County Councilors had a different opinion on these reports and unanimously agreed for them to be excluded from this comprehensive plan update

Despite the clear directives from the policy makers, the Clark County Board of Councilors, the reports remain listed on the Community Development site as "Resource Documents" for the 2016

elected officials. This diminishes and stifles the ability to advance local discretion, which is clearly recognized in the GMA and upheld in the Courts time and again.

There is no oversight to ensure that the policies set forth by the County Councilors, is indeed upheld and implemented by the planning staff, county attorneys, and the planning commission.

Who is responsible for ensuring the oversight and the integrity of the process?

Thank you,

Susan Rasmussen for CCCU, Inc

---

---

From: Madore, David

Sent: Friday, September 25, 2015 12:52 PM

To: 'susan rasmussen'; Orjiako, Oliver; Madore, David

Cc: McCauley, Mark

Subject: RE: very different views of interpretation

Oliver,

If I remember correctly, our last Comp Plan Work Session covered the topic of extracurricular documents and nonessential policies and information being included in the Comp Plan. The consensus of the BOCC was to avoid all ingredients that are not essential in the Comp Plan. Instead, our direction is to only include what is necessary.

We can make more timely updates and improvements to policies if they are outside of the Comp Plan.

This Comp Plan update is our opportunity to remove extras from the Comp Plan. I believe that is the direction already communicated. If this matter needs a formal vote of the BOCC to clearly establish that direction, please let us know. Otherwise, I will assume that staff is fully onboard and working toward that end.

Please let me know if the path forward needs better clarification.

Thank you,

---

From: Orjiako, Oliver

Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 1:03 PM

To: Madore, David

Cc: McCauley, Mark; Cook, Christine

Subject: FW: very different views of interpretation

Hello Councilor:

In response to your email dated September 25, 2015, Staff does not see the comp plan as an opportunity to remove extras as you stated. The comp plan update is an opportunity to review and include recent changes to the state statute, recent changes to the plan text and any pending policy direction from the past Board and the present Councilors. What is necessary I believe is the need for further public discussion and deliberation on several levels. I have no idea what 'extracurricular documents and non-essential policies' are being referred to here. First of all, everything that is in the comp plan now is county policy. The comp plan is compilation of work adopted by previous Boards, which means it is hardly non-essential. The comp plan is missing some key provisions of county policy also adopted, albeit more recently, by previous Boards.

The GMA requires eight elements, listed in RCW 36.70A.070:

1) A Land Use element. Comp Plan Chapter 1.

- 
- 2) A Housing element Comp Plan Chapter 2
  - 3) A capital facilities plan element Comp Plan Chapter 6
  - 4) A utilities element Comp Plan Chapter 6
  - 5) A rural element Comp Plan Chapter 3, also includes natural resources
  - 6) A transportation element Comp Plan Chapter 5
  - 7) An economic development element (Comp Plan Chapter 9), and
  - 8) A parks and recreation element (cue the recently adopted/acknowledged/talked about Parks plan) Comp Plan Chapter 7

The Environmental Element (Comp Plan Chapter 4) covers the required critical areas ordinances and stormwater program The Shoreline Master Program policies (also required) are in Comp Plan Chapter 13

What do we do with the Historic, Archaeological and Cultural Resource element (Comp Plan Chapter 8)? Do we tell the schools that they are not important (Comp Plan Chapter 10)? The GMA Land Use element includes a statement that says 'wherever possible, the land use element should consider utilizing planning approaches to promote physical activity' Should we not integrate the Growing Healthier Report prepared jointly by Public Health and Community Planning and the Aging Readiness Report which has its own Board-appointed commission into the comp plan, both of which were adopted by previous boards? The county has a sustainability policy which we intend to include Do we leave that out because it's county policy but somehow not worthy of being in the comp plan?

Perhaps we need a formal hearing for the Councilors to identify what those elements in the existing plan and previous Board directives should be removed or not included Thank you

Best,  
Oliver

---

Sent Tuesday, September 29, 2015 1 40 PM  
To Orjiako, Oliver, Madore, David  
Subject RE very different views of interpretation  
Oliver,

The policies published here may have been those of previous boards But I believe that they are not in agreement with the current board

[http://www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/community/growing\\_healthy/documents.html](http://www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/community/growing_healthy/documents.html)

They include such social engineering agendas as forcing citizens out of their cars into high capacity transit, purposely increasing traffic congestion, adding tolls to our freeways, trumping sound local best practices with an agenda to stop global warming, fragmenting the families of rural citizens, and more unhealthy practices that stagnate and oppress the citizens of our community We will follow and appropriate process to eliminate these unhealthy choices from our adopted policies and from the Comp Plan These are policy decision that we as a Board are responsible to determine Please support our endeavor as a Board to make these corrections

I welcome your feedback

Thank you,  
David

---

From Orjiako, Oliver  
To Madore, David  
Cc McCauley, Mark  
Subject RE very different views of interpretation

Date: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 2:44:37 PM

Hello Councilor:

As I stated in my previous email reply, when staff presents the plan text with policies to the Councilors in a formal hearing the Councilors will identify what those elements in the existing plan and previous Board directives should be removed or not included. Thank you.

---

Note : Multiple emails go to David Madore's US Digital email. David Madore meets the public records requirements by emailing county business emails to his county email. There is no way to check whether all correspondence has been forwarded.

---

David Madore

Begin forwarded message:

From: DONALD MCISAAC <[donalddmcsaac@msn.com](mailto:donalddmcsaac@msn.com)>

Date: November 23, 2015 at 7:15:54 AM PST

To: David Madore <[david.madore@usdigital.com](mailto:david.madore@usdigital.com)>

Subject: Process

David-

The State review process is a bit different than what I spoke of earlier: there may not be a mandatory State review process prior to the final adoption, but rather a 60 day notification of the Department of Commerce that final adoption is imminent, with the possibility of a State Hearings Board review only if someone appeals. See below. No changes on my perspective of the draft to final SEIS process.

See screenshot of Oliver's "Remaining Process" slide as it was presented Sept 3 and 10. On Nov 9, he changed the final EIS from December 15 to Feb 16.

See also the short State published primer on the update process, including sections 3 and 4: "legislative action" (action by elected County officials) and submittal to the State.

<http://www.commerce.wa.gov/Documents/GMS-Periodic-Update-Keeping-Plan-Current-Sept-2012.pdf#page=8&zoom=auto,-99,377>

Notice also in this primer that after the 60 day notice is given to Commerce that a final adoption is imminent, a 60 day window for "any person or organization" to appeal begins (bottom of page 13). It would be after an appeal that the State Board reviews the County action, not before, as any appeal goes to them before court, according to this document.

I will try to call this morning.

In the end, I still see the process on Tuesday to be

1. Properly adopt a Preferred Alternative that is a mix of the Alternatives, with Alternative 1 only being the remaining parts of status quo not changed by revised A-4, A-3, and any relevant parts of A-2.
2. Instruct the staff to complete a final FEIS using the proper policy choices for planning assumptions and the best available information.
3. Instruct the staff to modify and update the CMP document in accordance with the Preferred Alternative and any relevant policy decision since the last document update.

Thanks,  
Don

---

Example: Citizen forums – differential response

Complaint from CCCU

From: Carol Levanen  
To: Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom; Rita Dietrich; Madore, David; Orjiako, Oliver; Silliman, Peter  
Subject: Supporters of CCCU tax dollars being used against them by the county - For the Public Record  
Date: Thursday, July 09, 2015 12:36:51 PM

Dear Councilors,  
Clark County Citizens United, Inc. is adamantly opposed to our tax dollars being used to promote the head of a neighborhood association's political agenda against us. We are keenly aware of the costs involved in mass mailings and believe it is not the county's position to take sides and allow this sort of thing to occur. Alternative 4 is the only document that will set things right for all rural landowners. To see this newsletter being used to oppose this option and misrepresent the intent and purpose of this alternative, using county tax dollars, is clearly biased.

The county taxes have no business funding such activity and CCCU, Inc. considers it an outrage for doing so.

We urge the Councilors to stop this policy as soon as possible, before it does any more damage. If this person wants to spread her political agenda to the neighborhood, she needs to do it on her own dime.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary  
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.  
P.O. Box 2188  
Battle Ground, Washington 98604

[http://www.clark.wa.gov/neighborhoods/documents/Fairgrounds\\_07-2015.pdf](http://www.clark.wa.gov/neighborhoods/documents/Fairgrounds_07-2015.pdf)

Response from David Madore

From: Madore, David  
To: Carol Levanen  
Subject: Re: Supporters of CCCU tax dollars being used against them by the county - For the Public Record  
Date: Thursday, July 09, 2015 1:25:05 PM

Carol,

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. I had not realized that using public funds to publish such content amounts to inappropriately fund advocacy.

Freedom of speech is best exercised when the advocates fund their own.

Thanks

David Madore

---

Contrast: Clark County Citizens United Community Forum – February 12, 2016

**David Madore**

January 27 ·

Shenanigans happen. The competition has been fierce:

“Trust the staff. They are the experts.” - Trust, but verify.

“That fact checking process has been an eye opening experience that revealed that the numbers reported by planning staff were, in fact, agenda driven. GIS staff has been a fabulous help and a reliable source of uncompromised truth. That truth revealed planning assumptions used by the planning staff, significantly changed the tallies reported to the councilors to achieve a political agenda.”

I urge you to read the Op-ed in this week’s Reflector:

[http://www.thereflector.com/.../page\\_3e7a8335-88f1-5c5b-a496-...](http://www.thereflector.com/.../page_3e7a8335-88f1-5c5b-a496-...)

Citizens have one last opportunity to turn the tide or forever hold their peace. Will you make a difference?

# Alternative 4 Town Hall Meeting

**WHO:** Sponsored by  
Clark County Citizens  
United

**WHERE:** Hockinson  
High School (in the  
Commons), 16819 NE  
159th St, Brush Prairie

**WHEN:** Fri., Feb. 12,  
7–9 p.m.



---

**David Madore**

February 15

Thanks to videographer Jim Karlock, the video of Friday's Town Hall meeting is now available online. Dr Don McIsaac's presentation is queued up here:  
<https://vimeo.com/155251268#t=831s>

I hope to clip individual sections and post them soon for easy navigation

Knowledge is power, both for citizens and citizen representatives. Thanks again to the rural citizens, Clark County Citizens United, and the other 15 organizations that sponsored this event.

It was intended to be an opportunity for citizens to engage with their county councilors. Even though Jeanne Stewart, Julie Olson, nor Marc Boldt showed up, citizens can still help their county councilors to better understand on Tuesday morning at 10 am on the 6th floor at 1300 Franklin. Bring quarters for the parking garage on the north side of the Public Service Center.

**David Madore**

February 13

Town Hall Meeting packed the house at Hockinson High School

This snapshot was only able to capture a portion of the room filled with rural citizens with hands raised in support of our adopted Comp Plan Preferred Alternative.

Of the 200 or so citizens, 4 hands were then raised to repeal the plan in favor of Alternative 1, the status quo plan that's been in place since 1994.

Tom Mielke and I were there to listen and answer questions. Julie Olson, who said she would be there, did not show up. Neither did Marc Boldt or Jeanne Stewart.

15 other organizations took part in the Town Hall meeting hosted by Clark County Citizens United. Dr Don McIsaac presented an excellent report and knocked it out of the ballpark with such clarity and professionalism. Thanks to Jim Karlock, who videotaped the meeting, we should be able to post that presentation shortly.

Jim Katzinski of Pacific Legal Foundation (PLF), was a panelist along with other professionals to answer questions and provide support for the citizens. PLF has successfully defended citizens' private property rights across the nation winning multiple cases before the US Supreme Court. They are standing by to defend our rural citizens if necessary.

The most important meeting for citizens to appeal to their citizen representatives will be Tuesday at 10am on the 6th floor of the Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin, Vancouver. Bring quarters for the parking garage on the north side.

If the county council votes to repeal the Preferred Alternative and readopt the old 1994 Alternative-1 Plan, the citizens are ready to defend their rights in court. I hope that the county will instead, choose to be on the citizens' side to defend their private property rights and the plan that fully complies with the GMA.



**David Madore** shared Clark County Republican Party's event.

February 15 ·

Last call. It's now or never.

Since Jeanne Stewart, Julie Olson, and Marc Boldt did not attend the Town Hall meeting created for them, you can still be sure they hear your plea Tuesday before making the most important county decision in decades.

The Public Hearing following this meeting was posted as an Event on Facebook:



FEB

16

Interested

### Protect Your Property Rights - Alternative 4 Hearing

Tue 10 AM · Public Service Center, sixth-floor hearing room, 1300 Franklin St., Vancouver (map)

17 people interested · 14 people going

Protect your private property rights! The Clark County Council's next apparent target for repeal is their scheduled "reconsideration" of Alternative 4. This is the same issue where so many concerned citizens came to a townhall meeting last Friday to ask questions and express their views -- and yet all three of the most recently elected councilors failed to attend and listen to them.

You can make SURE they listen by attending the upcoming council meeting on this Tuesday, Feb 16 at 10:00 am.

RSVP to this event page, then please SHARE this event on your timeline, and be sure to click the link to "Invite Your Friends". See you there!

Following Board vote in February 2016 FB Post:

[David Madore](#)

[Like This Page](#) · [February 23](#) · [Edited](#)

Why can't we just get along to fight as a team against the citizens?

Four words: It's not about you.

When we get hired under false pretenses to do the job of representing the citizens that trusted us with their vote to be their voice and their advocate, we are not the victim. We are the offender.

When we make promises to protect and defend citizens' private property rights and then do everything in our power to take them away, we are not the victim. We are the offender.

[http://julieolsonforclark.com/Julie\\_Olson/Issues.html](http://julieolsonforclark.com/Julie_Olson/Issues.html)

<http://www.marcboldt.com/what-i-believe.php#navbar>

When we campaign for limited government, lower taxes, less regulations, for more freedom and unity, and then do the opposite after taking office, we are not the victim. We are the offender.

When we run on a platform to represent ALL the citizen and then rescind the citizen passed ballot measures including the one passed by a record breaking landslide vote (our voter approved Light Rail policy), we are not the victim. We are the offender. <http://gis.clark.wa.gov/Election/2013/>

When we fail to even show up at the citizen organized Town Hall meeting put on for us to better understand, and then we vote to kill Alternative 4 and every available rural citizen option, we are not the victim.

We are the offender.

---

When we are called on the carpet to answer for our actions that hurt others, we are not the victim  
We are the offender

When we wonder why others don't join with us to war against the citizens we are sworn to defend,  
we are not the victim. Rather, we make our friends and our neighbors who trusted us, the victims of  
our actions

Today was another sad disastrous day for Clark County citizens  
But do not settle for the injustice. Do not accept being a victim

I encourage each citizen to defend your human rights stripped away today. The county fought  
against the citizens in 1994 and citizens won on every count. But the citizens trusted the county to  
make the corrections identified by the judge. The county ran out the clock instead.

We will win again if we work together. And this time, we will require the court order to be obeyed.  
I encourage you to support and work with  
Clark County Citizens United  
PO Box 2188  
Battle ground, WA 98604  
ccuinc@yahoo.com  
360-667-0516



**Robert Dean**

April 5 at 3:03am · 🌐

Many of my close friends are members of Clark County Citizens United. Every one of them is an advocate for citizens rights, including private property rights - just like **David Madore**.



**Anna Miller**

April 4 at 6:38pm · 🌐

I came across this Facebook message that was posted by the large rural lands/private property rights organization, Clark County Citizens United. It is a statement in support of the re-election of David Madore for Clark County Council, District 3. This is the David Madore I know. I am proud to call him friend and grateful for his love and commitment to our Community. Please read their statement below:

"Clark County Citizens United, Inc. fully supports your willingness to be a candidate for Position 3 and to serve the public for another 4 years. You have been, without a doubt, the finest commissioner/councilor Clark County has ever had. In addition, you have always conducted yourself in an honest, kind and professional manner while showing the public that you really do care about them and their welfare and want to help them whenever you can. You're a person who stays up late at night to help the people, and even sometimes works on their behalf until morning, getting no sleep at all. You ask for nothing in return from the people and yet you give your all on their behalf. That is true commitment! Thanks for all you have done and all you do on behalf of Clark County and it's people!"

Clark County Citizens United

👍 Like

💬 Comment

➦ Share

👤 14