

Adam Zack

From: joe symons <joesymons@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 6:46 PM
To: Timothy P. Blanchard; Pete Moe (petemoe@gmail.com)
Cc: fred klein; Natalie Menacho; Keara Axelrod; Sam Dillingham; Lynda Guernsey; Comp Plan Update
Subject: Conversation with Plan Ahead San Juans on Wednesday afternoon 18 April 2018

Thank you both for coming to share your ideas and perspective regarding the work you are doing with/for the Planning Commission regarding the update to the Comp Plan, and in particular your current work on the Vision Statement.

I feel you are approaching this challenge with sincerity, wisdom, intelligence, hard work and real sensitivity to the complexity of the many forces that need to be considered. I truly appreciate it, especially in the context of how things have (not) worked in the past.

I am grateful that the original vision statement crafted 25+ years ago is still pretty much the anchor for the current vision, showing how consistent residents are. It appears that the same values and concerns expressed then are even more significant, and I appreciate the care you are taking in weaving new threads into this old strong fabric.

What concerns me the most is that your work, not only on the Vision, but in subsequent efforts on the CP and, I assume, the UDC, will be truly honored in the final signed document. As you know, the current Vision is essentially window dressing. I hope the revised Vision will be anchored by a UDC that supports it rather than ignores it.

As I mentioned, the arc of growth in the county has been and continues to be dominated by market forces and not the CP. Creating a viable path to a Plan driven future, and not a market driven one, will require considerable dexterity, wisdom and community buy-in. Right now the opportunity for real conversations doesn't exist.

I am hoping that the "build out analysis" will be sufficiently robust and thorough that it will not be difficult for locals to grasp the significance of what lies in store for us: this analysis, to be meaningful, has to include the impact of visitors, not just a graphic of "more little houses" on a map. Visitors are not addressed by GMA, under which the CP is currently being updated. However, the Vision statement is a larger and more important umbrella than GMA.

In the docket application I have submitted, and in other emails, I reference a summary web page regarding what constitutes a buildout analysis, which includes impacts. The link to this page follows:

<https://conservationtools.org/guides/42-build-out-analysis>

One area that begs for translation is the definition of so many critical "feel good" terms in the vision statement, such as "rural", "community", "local need", "isolated nature", and many others that I've discussed in my formal comments sent to the PC following your January workshop and in anticipation of your 16 march hearing.

I believe I can speak for the other members of the PASJ team in thanking you for your time and dedication to not only sharing your views with us, but for the far more significant time you have, are, and will be devoting to this update.

Please let us know how we can facilitate the conclusions you come to, support your work, disseminate the findings, create community conversation opportunities, and ensure that we have a plan that truly honors our vision.

Thanks again.

Joe Symons

—

carpe diem