

**From:** Ken Zeier  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 16, 2009 6:04 PM  
**To:** Grady, Brian  
**Subject:** Northeast plan

Mr. Grady,

Note: My comments are based on my observations. Therefore they do not represent truth. That only exists in the Holy Bible.

The Schnurbusch family made some points worth mentioning again in their July letter. They wrote a letter against the Madison NE plan. Madison is eating up farmland. That's bad. What's worse, strip malls for lack of a better term, will replace good clean land. Then, the strip malls go out of business and decay in bad economic times. This is the story of cities expanding all over the country.

The Schnurbusch family also spoke of dislocations of families. Long again I realized that it wouldn't be long until the same government system that justified running the indians off the land would be running the white man off. Someone always finds some justification for running people off the land.

From the Madison Plan:

In that sustainable society:

SP 4.....people are not subject to conditions that systematically undermine their capacity to meet their needs.

I ask, how does destroying good farmland not undermine the capacity of the people to meet their [basic food] needs? This question will be ignored, because development is a foregone conclusion and there is no serious attempt make this sustainable goal a reality.

I grew up on a farm just north of Madison and I've personally watched development eat up land piecemeal. In 1972, Wisconsin DOT took 25 acres of my Dad's land in the Town of Burke to widen 51 and 19, and they said it benefited him and they paid him little more than a token. He died in 1997 and never saw a benefit. The government always dreams up benefits that are nothing more than speculation. Since then more farms have been eaten up in a piecemeal [I think they say leapfrog] manner, ruining good farmland in the Waunakee, Sun Prairie, DeForest and Windsor areas. Remember, it was this land that Wisconsin used to build itself years ago-- and the land remained in an altered but not a destroyed condition.

In a sustainable society, Nature is not subject to systematically increasing.....;

SP 1 ....concentrations of substances extracted from the Earth's crust—fossil fuels, heavy metals and minerals

SP 2. ....concentrations of man-made substances –chemicals and un-natural products

SP 3. ....degradation by physical means—deforestation, land, air and water pollution,

Highways are concentrations of substances. We need roads, yes, but the old county roads mixed in well and didn't result in the imbalances that freeway systems create. Also, why is "nature" capitalized? Is is a proper noun? Since when? Since pagan thought started dominating American civilization? Mother Earth is a mother of Nature apparently. That kind of thinking might resonate with the pseudo-intellectuals, the worldly wisemen, but it doesn't resonate with truth.

As long as planners' jobs depend on development, and developers' primary interest is in making money, the land is doomed. Planning documents for the most part are window dressing and represent damage control. There are so many creative plans that are examined because of the intentional blinders that people with special interests place on themselves.

Sincerely,

Ken Zeier