

## RADICAL ENVIRONMENTALISM

Continued from page 9

right to own that land by those individuals is protected by the 9<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments to the U. S. Constitution. They don't own it and neither does any state or the federal government.

Obviously, if we believe the environmentalists about habitat preservation, or global warming, or CO2 in the oceans, or auto emissions, or warming or cooling currents, or depletion of the ozone layer, or DDT use, or dioxin, or mining glaciers, or biospheres, or wildlands, or yellow rain, or endangered and invasive species, or any other of "sky-is-falling" disasters "they" say will befall us, if we don't capitulate and live "green", civilization as we know it will surely die. This is nothing but dread and lies to get your money.

No matter what humans do or try to do, they will not have anywhere near the effect that the natural forces governing the earth, the sun, the other planets, the galaxies and the universe as a whole, will have.

Because you see, the universe, our solar system and even our earth are violent, dangerous places to humans and other life forms and always have been. Just ask the dinosaurs. So far, we have just been lucky. A dose by its gigantic comet supernova in the spiral arm of the Milky Way, in which our solar system resides, could flood the Sun and planets with massive amounts of deadly radiation and render them lifeless and barren. (There is a theory being discussed right now, where massive extinction on Earth correspond with super novae explosions throughout time, in our part of the galaxy.)

If the Sun changed its energy output by a significant fraction, all life on Earth could cease. An errant asteroid or gigantic rock

for generations. Wases of former farmland, in ever increasing circles around major population centers, turns into residential neighborhoods. The fact is that most people, given a reasonable choice, choose to live in these 'burbs.

But it has been decided by the political machine that this is a bad thing. People should not be allowed to build homes in new neighborhoods (unless they are mega-developments by Weyerhaeuser, but that is another issue entirely.)

So not only was Charles not allowed to develop under then current zoning, he can't even develop under the new lesser zoning due to traffic concurrency rules while Quadrant is allowed to develop thousands of new homes just to his north, from unmarked forestland. Traffic concurrency studies with regard to Redmond Ridge are the subject of lawsuits and corruption allegations. Charles should have had his original zoning vested as was the case with Port Blakeley and others who applied before the downzone, but he is just a rural landowner, not a wealthy developer with connections.

It is also interesting to note that at about the same time that the Snoqualmie Valley and the rest of East King County was undergoing a massive downzone, Quadrant was being approved for Redmond Ridge. Development rights were taken from thousands of small, rural landowners and given to mega-developers.

But it gets better. This year the 20 acres on

which have the power to erase the human species from its surface forever.

Environmentalists make decisions and cry "wolf" on very little data and way too short time periods to come up with meaningful predictions. But in the final analysis,

## THE CHARLES STROUSS STORY

Charles' south line suddenly turned into four 5 acre tracts. This was mysterious because traffic concurrency should have disallowed it. However, according to Charles, the property was owned by well established lawyers who simply went to county court and obtained some kind of permission to subdivide without having to even apply to DDES! One minute it's a 20 and the next, it is four 5 acre tracts.

Charles Strouss is a rural landowner with a house on 40 acres surrounded by suburban 1/2 acre to 2 acre development. He has a huge mortgage and pays \$15,000.00 a year in property taxes. He has \$50,000.00 and nearly 20 years trying to do reasonable development on this property while watching others plans nearby being approved. Is this fair and equitable treatment?

When the two DDES agents showed up on Strouss' property that late November day they should have known there was a potential for conflict. With the passage of the CAO rural landowners nerves were raw. The agents displayed the typical arrogant attitude that has only added to the problems. "Tell you how it's gonna be" is just asking for trouble.

This is a typical story that reflects poorly on the management of DDES. The training can't include respect of private property and landowners when agents repeatedly trespass and threaten citizens with enforcement actions. There are few rural owners who can

walk us to make most of their predictions meaningless.

The only way to stop this madness is to stop donating to environmental groups. Dry up their funds and you render them impotent. Spread the word that environmentalists

comply fully and always with all the codes. Most don't even know they are in violation. Activists have been complaining about this for years now. I wrote a letter to the King County Prosecutor over four years ago with documentation proving that DDES agents were regularly committing trespass which violated state law and the county's own code. I never got the pleasure of a reply. I have written numerous papers and e-mails and have testified before the King County Council warning that the county could not afford these conflicts and that they were cumulative. The new CAO has a provision allowing agents access to private property as if trespass law did not exist. When the inevitable violence occurs county officials will no doubt blame it on an "unreasonable landowner."

Place yourself in Charles Strouss' position. He found the resources, took the risks and made the effort to own land. He made the payments, taxes and fees just like everyone before him. He played by the rules when he proposed his project. Where is the reward?

This story defines "Smart Growth" and "Sprawl Reduction" in ways you will not find on the Futurewise or King County websites. Their glossies won't tell you that the folks in charge at King County have decided there is not going to be "inappropriate" development by small landowners. Challenge them! Maybe they will respond with a 9mm pointed at the back of your head.

Have them live on top of each other in 25-story buildings and 800 square foot apartments in densities approaching 35,000 people per square mile. OK, and don't let cities encroach into the rural lands. To gain ground, don't go out or in. Environmentalism has become a