

Linda Ann Kuller

From: Ingrid Gabriel
Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2017 9:50 AM
To: Comp Plan Update
Subject: FW: newspaper articles from ~2000

From: Jan Alderton [mailto:janetmalderton@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2017 3:30 PM
To: joe symons <joesymons@me.com>
Cc: pete moe <petemoe@gmail.com>; Mark Mayer <tmarkmayer@mac.com>; Marguerite Greening <mgreening@orcasonline.com>; Jan Ehrlichman <janeln@mac.com>; Toby Cooper <toby@tobycooper.net>; Sarah Cooper <sarah@sarahcooper.com>; Lisa Seehof <lroseh1959@gmail.com>; Emily McGerty <efairlight@yahoo.com>; Brian Wiese <brian_wiese@outlook.com>; Sandi Friel <sandi@rockisland.com>; Alex Callen <alexcallen@gmail.com>; Jan Loudin <loudin@rockisland.com>; Ellen Winter <ellenbwinter@yahoo.com>; Norris <sheyd@snet.net>; Sarah Ross <sayrahross5@gmail.com>; Fred Klein <freddythek10@gmail.com>; Katie Ann Wilkins <katieannwilkins@gmail.com>; Ryan Morris <rmorris@startmail.com>; cstewart167@gmail.com; Caitlin Herlihy <artofnourishment@gmail.com>; Jackie Brumfield <jackiebrumfield@gmail.com>; Erika Shook <erikas@sanjuanco.com>; DL - Council <Council@sanjuanco.com>; Margie Doyle <gemini@interisland.net>; Hayley Day <hday@sanjuanjournal.com>
Subject: Re: newspaper articles from ~2000

Hi Joe,
Please explain further the bolded sentence:

"Note that this info was based on the revised CP density map that was developed by SJC consequent to the successful challenge by our little band of land use stewards. **This map would be a disaster if it were to show the CP before the density map was found to “substantially interfere” with the goals of GMA.**"

Janet

On Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 2:56 PM, joe symons <joesymons@me.com> wrote:

I sent those in the To; address field a few photos of the pile of info I have on the previous comp plan process earlier today.

Below I attach 4 scans of newspaper articles from the early years of 2000.

comments precede each article.

The first 2 scans are of a Sounder article that is too big for a single scan. I've scanned most of it in 2 pieces. The key piece of info is the map. A careful look at the legend in the upper left shows that at buildout, there would be an estimated 32270 sfr's (homes) with an average of 2.175 persons/structure (the data available at the time) for a buildout population, not including ADU's, density bonuses or visitors, of slightly over 70,000.

Note that this info was based on the revised CP density map that was developed by SJC consequent to the successful challenge by our little band of land use stewards. This map would be a disaster if it were to show the CP before the density map was found to “substantially interfere” with the goals of GMA. See comments at the end.

note that the first scan below is in landscape orientation so you will have to double click on it to see the full page:

The article here points out the classic challenge of staying silent. It is a reminder that the silent majority has no impact on politicians. We need to be the noisy minority tho i'd prefer it was the noisy majority.

The article below was written by Darcie Nielsen, who was the long range planner guiding the CP update process before she ran for BOCC and won. As above, the article is scanned in landscape mode; double click to read it all. She refers to a survey of public opinion regarding density options that was sent to county residents in the mail. There were 3 options that were developed and presented. The survey was controversial in that the public was not a participant in the survey design: it was very poorly done and confusing. Even so, the public overwhelmingly chose the least development option. The public's opinion was ignored. BTW the web address shown in the article is no longer available. It is possible that I or others have the survey somewhere in our files; I don't know if the library or SJC DCD has any of this material.

The survey was created (I believe) because the WWGMHB in July of 1999 found the county's 1980 density in egregious violation of GMA; the county had to downzone. An excerpt of the western Board's FDO appears below the article.

From the July 1999 FDO by the WWGMHB:

At the very inception of the GMA process in 1992, the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) made a policy decision that existing densities established in 1979 for the 1980 CP would not be changed and would not be the subject of any discussion. As the County acknowledged at the HOM, this policy decision was made without any analysis from staff, the public or the BOCC themselves.

A great deal of time in public hearings thereafter involved repeated requests for the BOCC to reverse this policy. The frustration this decision caused was eloquently summarized in the introduction of the brief of amici as follows:

"It is common knowledge in the San Juan County community that the density zoning enacted in 1979 after years of freedom to develop almost at will, was controversial, aroused passions and involved no evaluation of the cumulative impacts of development on rural character or conservation of natural or cultural resources. The preference of landowners was surely the single most influential criteria (sic) applied. Though a valid and useful beginning for local planning at that time, it is an understatement to say this process was more arbitrary than evaluative and by no means can be deemed to comply with state law requirements for obtaining the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment, achieving a balance between population and resource use, or

providing a rational basis for directing development patterns and accommodating change based on designation of lands and evaluation of impacts. RCW 43.21C.020(2)(c),(f) and 36.70A.”

<http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/LoadDocument.aspx?did=650>

(note: the document formatting presented on the GMHB web site above omits page numbers and line numbers. The quote above is from page 4)

Joe Symons

Olga WA

for more on the CP issues, see

doebay.net/appeal