

Linda Ann Kuller

From: joe symons <joesymons@me.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2017 12:05 PM
To: East Sound Update; Comp Plan Update
Cc: Toby Cooper; Gregory Ayers; Kevin Ranker; Jeffrey Otis; Mark Mayer; Jan Alderton; Sandi Friel
Subject: Comments re EPRC Eastsound Vision

I've read the vision and pillars and want to thank you and all participants for an extraordinary set of defining concepts and vision.

What is not said must be inferred. I would encourage you to add a section (perhaps an appendix) to explicitly state what is not said. Namely, (as I read it), that Eastsound does not want to become like..

Here you guys can thumb wrestle, but my first foray would be to say "Friday Harbor", and other entries might be Anacortes or LaConner or..

And then I'd say why your vision and pillars are inconsistent with these examples. If you can, I'd pick some known and mutually-agreed examples, tho all examples will be snapshots rather than consistent long term predictable populations and images (say, like Yellowstone or Yosemite).

Second, the vision and pillars needs to be translated into metrics to reduce ambiguity in interpretation. If not specific numbers (like only so many sfr's, duplexes, etc.) then some kind of metric that creates a relatively definable "line" so there is little to no ambiguity about when the line is crossed.

for example, the vision says:

worthy of our **natural surroundings**. We value and actively **preserve open spaces, views, and access to the land and sea** around us. We honor those who have **stewarded this island** before us. We are committed to our history, culture, arts, and to the **deep and restorative stewardship of our ecosystem**. To ensure a thriving community for all, we champion **sustainability and regenerative systems, tread lightly on the land, and shape our future in harmony with nature**.

I take this as describing a pretty low key (a word used a lot in the pillars) slow, gentle, not growing much, thoughtful, respectful, nature dominated or deeply honored player kind of limited space. the highlighted sections have to be honored lest this document be an example of doublespeak. While technology will impact the details, what I read here is a kind of ***boundary***, a definition begging for a clarity in determining ***full*** and a clear mandate to not exceed this physical, spatial, financial, environmental, community "sense".

here are terms from the pillars that reinforce this interpretation:

- environmentally low-impact businesses.
- village a safe and welcoming place for children. (emphasize "village" and "safety for kids")
- support small-scale organic farming
- forms of low-impact tourism
- respect, preserve, and protect Eastsound's existing wetlands

- protect, restore, and maintain Eastsound-area watersheds
- preserve our open skies
- preserve Eastsound’s open and natural spaces for their habitat and restorative values
- protect our valuable coastal and marine habitats, spawning grounds, and sea life along Eastsound’s shorelines
- create low-impact pedestrian access to shorelines
- require that future development be sustainable and prevent development that degrades the natural environment.
- eliminate light pollution and preserve undiluted night skies
- recognize that the spaces between buildings and views of the surrounding hills, East Sound, and Straits of Georgia contribute to the village character
- encourage a sense of discovery and tranquility
- ensure that island development not outpace local resources, including but not limited to water, energy, sewage treatment capacity, and essential services
- adopt an environmental sustainability index to measure our progress toward specific goals, including sustainable and renewable energy, energy efficiency, net zero waste, carbon negativity, and other markers
- use sustainability, as we have defined it, as an essential criterion for growth and development.
- engage in ongoing community forums to realize this vision and raise the quality of life for the people and enhance the health of the ecosystems of Orcas Island and the Salish Sea

I have not counted the number of pillar statements or words included above relative to the total number of pillar statements and words. Anecdotally it seems like at least half or more than half. There are important words in these statements, such as ***ensure, protect, prevent, restore, require, eliminate, adopt, use, realize*** These words are pretty directive.

One of the serious omissions of the 1994 BOCC adopted CP vision statement was that zero effort was made to translate the vision into objective, quantifiable, enforceable, prescriptive metrics that defined when a vision intention was met, and when it was violated.

I strongly encourage that this omission not occur in the final document. Including these metrics will set an example and standard for other county activity center visioning and particularly for the county comp plan update.

The idea is to prevent a vision metric from being violated. Forced demolition is going to be a difficult and last card to play. Clear annual metrics of the vision and pillar statements must be part of the ongoing process of monitoring and when a boundary becomes in sight, a pathway to closure generated and enforced. It will be a violation of all this work to not maintain vigilance in order to prevent a boundary crossing. Once a boundary is crossed, precedents are set, invalidating the boundary and opening up the opportunity to violate other boundaries. It's the camel's nose under the tent. Call me an absolutist. Even Century link, finally, had to close the DSL door when they had so grossly oversubscribed that their customers were suing them. Moran State Park does not add additional camping sites every year even as demand grows. Eastsound should take note. Full is full. Period. For a reminder, read the lyrics to Big Yellow Taxi. The issue is not that we're so stupid that we cannot anticipate boundary breaking pressure. The issue is whether we're courageous enough and fierce enough to say, and mean, and enforce, stop. The human record does not speak well to this requirement. Do not go gently into that dark night. Otherwise what you have done is window dressing.

Arguments that "you can't stop growth / GMA demands that UGA's must meet OFM requirements" are not relevant at this stage. We are creating a new model. If we are not, then all this work is deceptive and a betrayal. We must be prepared to argue, defend, enforce and prevail in institutionalizing this model.

Joe Symons

March 2017

Olga WA