

**David Madore**

6 hrs ·

Just the facts ma'am. No shenanigans needed:

Clark county has a terrific GIS department. Our GIS staff does a great job providing the crucially important records we depend on to plan the future of our community.

Their competent help and powerful mapping tools have enabled us to nicely optimize our 20-year Comp Plan and correct a chronic problem that has plagued our rural community for more than two decades.

The original Alternative 1 map and the community supported Alternative 4 map both consist of the same 28,812 rural parcels. A simple function exports those records to Excel and we tally the total number of potential rural lots. Up to this point, it's pure logic, objective facts, and uncontested truth. The facts are the facts.

But then something funny has been happening. Since 1994, the planning department, with an anti-rural growth agenda, has been using covert software to manipulate those records to grossly inflate the numbers reported as facts to unsuspecting county commissioners.

The software was discovered last year, reverse engineered, and revealed as 8 rules/assumptions shown in column A of the VBLM planning assumptions shown here on page 1:

https://www.clark.wa.gov/.../the-g.../112415_rev109_ExhibitA.pdf

After that discovery, last November, the Councilors adopted more accurate and realistic assumptions in column B and invited a consultant to provide a report that compared the two columns. But the planning staff blocked their column A assumptions from being scrutinized and worked to invalidate the councilors' column B assumptions instead.

Planning staff claimed that their column A assumptions were automatically valid even though they were not analyzed. The report pointed out that two of the planning staff assumptions were invalid, one was illegal, and others are policy calls at the discretion of the councilors.

In our January 13 work session, the planning staff then insisted that their 8 original column A assumptions were not hidden at all and had each been approved by the councilors.

The planning staff then changed that whopper to an even bigger one in our February 16 hearing by stating that their 8 column A assumptions were not their assumptions. The rambling claim confused urban with rural assumptions with other imagined assumptions.

When pressed to identify which one was wrong, they were not able to provide an honest answer. The forest parcels in "Current Use" were in fact, erroneously counted in Alternative 4, contrary to the attorney's claim.

In another whopper, the attorney falsely states that they did not even use a rural VBLM model. That's exactly what this software is.

http://www.cvtv.org/vid_link/17841?start=5342&stop=18535

When the truth keeps changing and such tactics are used to advance an agenda, we intuitively recognize that something is not right. Good decisions are based on truth, honesty, and transparency. No shenanigans needed.

| Ref | A (existing) | B (proposed) |
|-----|---|--|
| 1 | Every possible rural parcel shall be counted as a parcel that will develop regardless of conditions that would likely make such development unlikely. | These rural VBLM assumptions should be used not to reflect what is possible, but to reasonably plan for what is likely. Parcels that cannot reasonably be expected to develop should not be counted as parcels likely to develop. Cluster development remainder parcels that are known to be prohibited from further development should not be counted as parcels likely to develop. |
| 2 | Rural parcels located in areas far from basic infrastructure with continuous long term commercial forestry operations should be counted as parcels that will develop. | Parcels located in areas far from infrastructure with long term commercial forestry operations likely to continue should not be counted as likely to develop. These assumptions are not used to authorize or to prohibit the development of individual parcels. Rather, these assumptions should only be used for tallying parcel totals for general planning information. |
| 3 | Rural parcels including 100% of environmentally constrained areas that lack sufficient area for septic systems and well clearances shall be counted as rural parcels that will develop. | Rural parcels that have less than 1 acre of environmentally unconstrained land sufficient area for septic systems and well clearances should not be counted as likely to develop. |
| 4 | History shows that about 30% of dividable parcels with homes and 10% of vacant dividable parcels do not develop further. So those deductions have been applied to urban planning totals for years. But every rural parcel shall be counted as a parcel that will divide to the maximum degree possible. | History shows that about 30% of dividable parcels with homes and 10% of vacant dividable parcels do not develop further. So those deductions have been applied to urban planning totals for years. These same deductions should be applied to rural planning totals as well. |
| 5 | As long as county code allows, lots that are up to 10% smaller than the minimum lot size should be considered as conforming lots and counted as parcels likely to develop. | Same |
| 6 | Although county code prohibits most nonconforming parcels from developing, all nonconforming parcels with 1 acre shall be counted as rural parcels that will develop. | Due to some exceptions from the norm, 10% of nonconforming parcels with at least 1 acre of unconstrained area will likely develop. |
| 7 | A 15% urban Market Factor provides some margin for the law of supply and demand to comply with the GMA requirement to provide a sufficient supply and achieve the affordable housing goal. But a 0% Market Factor shall be used for rural areas. | A 7.5% rural Market Factor should be used to provide a reasonable margin for the law of supply and demand to comply with the GMA requirement to provide a sufficient supply and achieve the affordable housing goal. Implementation of this rural Market Factor is accomplished by deducting this percentage of parcels from the total available rural parcels. Note that this rural Market Factor is half of the urban Market Factor of 15% in order to also satisfy the GMA goal of reducing low density sprawl. |
| 8 | A 27.7% infrastructure deduction for infrastructure including roads, storm water, parks, schools, fire stations, conservation areas, lakes, streams, protected buffers, etc. A 0% deduction shall be used for rural areas. | Same |

Like Comment Share



Chronological



David Clark Lets tell the truth here: STAFF ROUTINELY LIES TO THE ELECTED OFFICIALS to get the outcome they desire. A very good example of this is Jeff Hamm hiding the \$5,000,000 poison pill in the C-Tran contract with TriMet analyzed here: <https://vimeo.com/84207743>
<https://vimeo.com/82158818>



How to get your board to agree to a \$5,000,000 "liquidated damages" clause

VIMEO.COM

Like · Reply · 2 hrs