

J. KELLER



Henry Westra, MSA, CMPE <henry.westra@gmail.com>

---

**FW: Public Comments re: Final Draft Swan Valley Regional Plan (Best viewed on a PC or MAC, as there are links to other websites for supporting detail)**

2 messages

---

**John Keller** <jkeller@cmpmontana.com>

Tue, Apr 10, 2018 at 3:09 PM

Reply-To: jkeller@cmpmontana.com

To: henry.westra@gmail.com, info <info@nordiquelohomes.com>

The Swan Valley Regional Plan report is too long.

The "Science" in the report is not current and/or complete, given the (more comprehensive) Flathead National Forest Plan which documents current conditions and future conditions for 90% of the Swan Valley Plan Area.

Many of the OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, ACTIONS documented in the SV Regional Plan are already provided for in the 400 pages of County Zoning and Subdivision Regulations, and the current NEPA processes.

To "replay" all of these in the Swan Valley Plan Area document only reminds everyone on how burdensome our governance processes have become, and how much human capital is wasted in the process.

The OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, ACTIONS in the Swan Valley Regional Plan are a bit vague as to WHO will do WHAT by WHEN and HOW we will monitor progress, and measure success.

There are 18 OBJECTIVES (haven't we been meeting all of these objectives over the last 100+ years of human progress in the Swan Valley- for both private and public lands-EVEN without all of the regulations?)

There are 23 "POLICIES"( It is not clear what is really meant by "POLICIES". The Swan Valley is not empowered to create POLICY. All we can do is ask the Agencies Having Jurisdiction to implement Policy. We should be **very careful** what we wish for.

There are 24 ACTIONS (Unless someone supplies lots of grant money, it is hard to imagine who will otherwise show up to work on all of these actions.)

The rhetoric in the document, in my view, provides an opportunity for the County Agencies to pick and choose the sentences and phrases that serve their purposes, and to ignore the rest.

It is not clear if the SV Plan document favors more regulations, or fewer regulations.

It is not clear if the SV Plan document favors a (revised) density map, or no density map at all. It should, at a minimum state that the current density map serves no useful purpose.

The one-size-fits-all GOALS, OBJECTIVES, ACTIONS in the County Growth POLICY has relevance for the Urban Fringe, but very limited application and relevance for the Swan Valley.

Expect more, not fewer, regulations across the board unless someone takes a stand to push back.

We need a different governance process that is of, by, and for the private land owners in the Swan Valley.  
(And for all Frontier Communities across MT)

And, we need to focus on a short list of **our** highest priorities. And, we need to make a practice of getting these things done.

I am happy to volunteer my personal time to work on any of the ACTIONS and IMPLEMENTATION STEPS outlined in the attached PDF.

Respectfully Submitted,

John Keller

677-7032

4-10-2018



**draftPUBLIC COMMENTS-SWAN VALLEY REGIONAL PLAN.pdf**  
403K

---

**Henry Westra, MSA, CMPE** <henry.westra@gmail.com>  
To: jkeller@cmpmontana.com

Tue, Apr 10, 2018 at 5:03 PM

Got it, John. And thanks.

Henry

[Quoted text hidden]