

# Madore quizzed on land-use proposals

## Open house on growth plan sees residents put questions to councilor



Aerial photo of homes in a rural area of Clark County, shot April 10, 2015. Kaitlin Gillespie/The Columbian

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.

But at least some of Madore's proposals might violate the state Growth Management Act. For example, Madore has proposed that parcels located in areas far from infrastructure with long-term forestry operations should not be counted as lots likely to develop. A note written in a version of Madore's assumptions sent to planning staff and the prosecutor's office for review last week put it bluntly.

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

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.

**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 environmentalist. Imagine that!!

Reply · 6 mins



**Lorretta Thomas**

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

Exactly!

Reply · 10 mins



**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 · 1 · 18 mins



**Ed Ruttledge** ·

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. If it 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 · 18 mins



**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 · 1 · 1 hr



**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 ·  1 · 3 hrs · Edited



**Mike Yancey** ·

Clark College -- Vancouver, Washington

Liza Qhimsa This is not a place to post your spm.

Reply · 2 hrs



**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 · 2 hrs



**Bridget McLeman**

It's called selling a pig in a poke.

Reply ·  3 · 7 hrs



**Jennifer Barnes**

This is a HOT mess.