

<p>The overlapping nature of the sections has created a great deal of repetition of policies and actions. For the reader and future user (unless it is mandated to be in this form) it might be more useful to discuss the Goals and then make a list of policies and actions. After each of these there could be a reference to the various pertinent (overlapping) Goals.</p>	<p>Reorganized actions and policies; merged redundant/overlapping actions/policies; matched wording of goals in different locations.</p>
<p>There is a notable and welcome focus on agriculture. That said, many of the actions and policies would benefit all types of cottage industries. By specifically calling out only agriculture it could appear that other cottage industries are not included.</p>	<p>Updated wording of actions; merged appropriate actions 1.12 & 1.21 into 1.4; moved 1.30 to 1.5; also updated paragraph 4 of Overview (10.1.A)</p>
<p>While the discussion in the introduction sections is forward leaning, the policies and actions could be more visionary in areas that would also serve other elements.</p>	<p>No specific change requested.</p>
<p>Page 1, line 6 there is an extra comma. We are unsure what the phrase “domestic tranquility and public peace” means. Do you intend to refer to public safety, an increased sense of security or wellbeing and stability shared by all residents? The growing sense of economic inequity cannot be dismissed in a community where most income is generated from accumulated wealth rather than current labor.</p>	<p>Edited paragraph 1 of "Overview 10.1.A" for clarity.</p>
<p>Page 1, line 9: The term “commodification” implies that the environment comprises resources to be commercially exploited through extraction or consumption. This is not the vision expressed in many other places in the Element and, we believe is not a vision shared by most residents. What is “monetary magnitude?” Is it in direct proportion to another thing or is it the only measure? We suggest that monetary magnitude is not the only nor should it be the main measure of our success.</p>	<p>Edited paragraphs 2-3 of "Overview 10.1.A" to clarify intended meanings.</p>
<p>Page 1, line 14: The phrase “growing economy” deserves some discussion. There is some dispute that an economy must grow to be healthy or to provide a high quality of life. The stimulus used historically to grow an economy has provided benefits for some at the expense of others. ... As noted in the Housing Needs Assessment, 40% of Lopez residents are considered cost burdened while we have the highest per capita income by county in the state. LIFRC envisions an economy that works for all residents.</p>	<p>Cut "and growing" as unnecessary source of confusion (paragraph 3 of Overview)</p>
<p>Page 1, line 20: Rising educational and tech infrastructure does not necessarily mean a higher quality of life.</p>	<p>Edited for clarity (paragraph 4 of Overview).</p>
<p>Page 1, line 31 misuses the term “indigenous.” “Resident” is a more appropriate word choice. This occurs in later places in the document as well.</p>	<p>Changed.</p>
<p>Page 1, line 34: define “community assets.”</p>	<p>Updated Goal 3 with definition.</p>
<p>Page 1, line 35: We need a clearer understanding of the term “rural character.” This is extremely arbitrary and subjective and is often used to discourage economic development.</p>	<p>See changes to paragraph 4 of Overview.</p>
<p>Page 2, line 19-20: We suggest that economic development should enhance the quality of life of ALL residents, not only the workforce.</p>	<p>Changed to "populace" (10.2.B Purpose, paragraph 2).</p>

Page 4: We suggest adding a simple statement that the County will prioritize its actions to support living wage job creation. We must invest at least equally if not more of ourselves (regulatory support) and our funds in creating living wage jobs rather than our past support for tourism's low wage jobs.	Not done because of comments and input supporting other priorities (disaster preparedness, environmental preservation, health care, housing, etc); however, did add emphasis on living wage jobs as appropriate.
Page 4, lines 10 et seq: The comments are initially repetitive. Embracing job creation that also prepares residents for resilience in the face of climate change, an ability to respond to inward climate migration, emergency preparedness, environmental stewardship, and energy independence builds resilience in a forward thinking way.	Removed duplicate comments (Goal 1; 10.3B.1)
Page 4, lines 27 and 36: the terms "natural capital" and "naturalassets" are economic terms more commonly associated with financeand banking. They imply that the environment is there for ourcommodification and exploitation; that we are somehowdisassociated from the ecosystem and the natural world, rather thana part of the whole.	No change needed: this is the Economic Development Element, so considering factors from economic and financial perspectives are appropriate.
Page 4, bottom: footnotes seem repetitive.	Corrected
Page 5, line 3: Not discussed is that it also causes residents tobecome more dependent on government services and the assistanceof community organizations serving the low income community.	Left out for brevity.
Page 5, lines 1-3: Perhaps include a reference about the need formental health care services to be immediately available.	Updated actions (Actions 2.9 & 4.11)
Page 5, lines 7-9: are you referring to government owned land?	This refers to commercial properties generally.
Page 5, Actions: At various places in this document there isreference to emergency preparedness and energy independence yetthere are no actions to examine either area for job creationopportunities. ...	Added to policy 4.2 after discussions with VC; suggested actions can fold into existing actions.
Page 5, line 10: there seems to be a singular focus on producingmaterial goods. We recommend adding services that have a lightenvironmental footprint like call centers, services for aging in place,and childcare.	Added to Action 1.4, modified Action 1.5 (old Action 1.30)
Page 5, line 28: If we can focus on sharing land and infrastructure foragriculture, why can't we do that for affordable housing?	No change made: belongs in housing element if can be implemented.
Page 6, line 3: There appears to be a word missing between"encouraging" and "clustered."	Corrected
Page 6, lines 9-10: These economic resource centers could beembedded or co-located with family resource centers to increaseaccess and impact across the County's major economic centers.	Seems best to leave unspecified at this time: could also make sense to be located in college, libraries, etc. (refers to action 1.9)
Page 6, Item 24 duplicates Item 1.	Corrected

<p>Page 6, Item 26: We suggest investing in sectors that result in livingwage, year round employment. Tourism does not meet thisdefinition and, in fact, exacerbates other downward trends like thelack of affordable housing.</p>	<p>Addressed in other actions (e.g. regarding knowledge work, manufacturing, ag). Comment refers to old action 1.27.</p>
<p>Page 6, Items 28 and 29 refer to Appendix A and B. Neither is attached to the Draft. As a cautionary note, if the goal is to preserve agriculture by allowing accessory uses, one must be very careful that the accessory use does not become the primary use with agriculture as a mere ornament or back drop. This is especially likely to occur in the area of events on agricultural land when the venue rental income far outpaces the income from agriculture. Events are also very likely to cause push back from neighbors impacted by noise, parking, and nighttime lighting and create enforcement issues for the County already hard pressed to enforce other regulations like vacation rentals.</p>	<p>A. Zack advised we should just include links, trasmit docs to council, and include in works cited.</p>
<p>Page 6, Items 28-30: Cottage industries should be encouraged inother sectors in addition to agriculture. These Items should bebroadened to include other cottage industries. Why can't we beanother Muscle Shoals (music recording studio) or writer's retreat(like Hedgebrook)? We are limited only by our imagination.</p>	<p>Merged and organized actions to clarify that encouraging other types of cottage industries (e.g. new action 1.4).</p>
<p>Page 8, lines 6-8: This would be another great place to list a broadercategory of desired industries with low environmental impacts andwhich might create a more resilient community</p>	<p>Incorporated with new action 2.3</p>
<p>Page 8, Goal 3: Part of our island infrastructure must includeimmediately accessible health care of all types and the ability to agein place.</p>	<p>Added aging-in-place and child care to Action 1.4 and already in existing Policy 1.6; mental health and other types of health care added to actions 2.9 and to Action 4.11.</p>
<p>Page 12, line 4: This is an odd place to park domestic violence, asthough it is only an impediment to having an adequate number ofworkers rather than seeing it as a harm to the social fabric of ourcommunity.</p>	<p>Clarified that this is about workforce resilience; combined with other actions that support invidual resilience (e.g. LIFRC request to add "immediately accessible health care"). (Referring tp new action 4.11/old action 4.9</p>
<p>Page 21, line 24: Why have we decided not to join?</p>	<p>Unknown (Referring to RTPOs)</p>
<p>Page 24, line 17: living wage jobs.</p>	<p>Unchanged. Living wage job creation is emphasized throughout the EDE; however, in the instances on this page, the jobs referred to may be part-time or seasonal, and therefore may not fit the definition of living wage jobs when taken in isolation.</p>

August 2, 2019
EDC Changes Requested and Made, 2019

<p>The term “natural capital” is not clearly defined in this document. This term, if used moving forward, should be defined with respect to San Juan County’s unique marine waters, forests, shorelines, wetlands, agricultural lands, and open spaces.</p>	<p>Definition added in footnote on p1 of Introduction</p>
<p>The term “man-made” should be changed to “human-caused” or a similar term that is gender-neutral.</p>	<p>Changed as requested.</p>
<p>There are two comments in this section that are largely repetitive and should be consolidated into either a footnote or into the body of the “Goal 1: Create Living Wage Jobs” section.</p>	<p>Corrected</p>
<p>We support the county’s position that San Juan County Code needs to be updated to clarify that marijuana is not an agricultural product. In addition to creating a regulatory framework for marijuana production that does not negatively impact local food and fiber production, we urge the county add protections in this section for natural resources, such as shorelines, wetlands, and forests.</p>	<p>Added request (to Action 1.21)</p>
<p>We support this policy to encourage Washington State Ferries “to improve San Juan Islands ferry service, vessels, and infrastructure...” ... We also urge the county to add: a statement about encouraging Washington State Ferries to invest in new quieter, hybrid-electric capable ferries for the San Juan Islands route.</p>	<p>Added this request to policy 3.4; however, did not specify the specific technology (as requested) because optimal technology may change over the time scale of the Comprehensive Plan and maintaining an old ferry may have lower lifetime environmental impacts than building a new one).</p>
<p>We support the policies related to improving oil spill prevention and oil spill response capacity. We suggest the following changes: Encourage and improve oil spill prevention, oil spill response preparedness, and oil spill response capacity (equipment, personnel, and volunteers) for oil spills within the county and oil spills elsewhere that threaten the county’s natural resources, economy, and the health and welfare of county residents.</p>	<p>Added (with edits) as an Action (Action 4.6).</p>
<p>We support this action, but suggest inclusion of climate adaptation measures, such as: i. “Design built infrastructure to incorporate the natural environment to help fulfill its function and over time, reduce its financial and/or environmental costs.</p>	<p>No change needed: requested action is already there (Action 3.4).</p>
<p>While we don’t have specific language changes related to this action, it is important to note that the larger issue of barge landing sites is essentially unresolved in the county. FSJ has concerns over wholesale support for expansion of new sites due to the potential impacts on marine habitats and human neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Edited for clarity and added : "... if consistent with preservation of the environment (e.g. shorelines, marine habitats) and human neighborhoods." to Action 3.7 (was Action 3.18)</p>
<p>We urge the county to support using Lodging Tax Funds for “environmental education and stewardship programs,” rather than specifically calling out “restoration programs,” given that restoration programs are likely to be too complex and expensive for this funding source but we support the intent of supporting environment actions with this type of funding..</p>	<p>Action 3.15 (formerly Action 3.24) edited to include support for environmental protection, education, and stewardship, as well as restoration.</p>
<p>We suggest the following changes: Encourage local citizens to become involved in disaster preparedness by publicizing the county’s vulnerability to transportation and communications interruptions; and its oil spill risk due to our close proximity to commercial vessel traffic, refineries, and terminals.</p>	<p>Edited action 4.3 to read: "Involve local citizens in disaster preparedness including by publicizing the county’s vulnerability to transportation and communications interruptions, and its oil spill risk due to its close proximity to commercial vessel traffic, refineries, and terminals."</p>

August 2, 2019
EDC Changes Requested and Made, 2019

<p>The following action appears to be based on previous SJC resolutions....We suggest the following changes: Improve oil spill response capacity by updating WAC 173-182-370 to require the 4- and 6-hour planning standards to be resident. Suggested additional action: Ensure adequate and sustainable funding for IOSA to provide oil spill response capacity (equipment, personnel and volunteers) in San Juan County, including wildlife response capacity, for oil spills in the waters of San Juan County.</p>	<p>Added clause about encouraging the WAC to be changed to Action 4.7 (formerly 4.6) and added a version of their suggested action (new Action 4.6) edited to allow greater flexibility.</p>
<p>QUESTION: Have drivers of high rent and land prices not been previously identified by the county? If there are previously-identified drivers, such as vacation rentals, we urge the county to list them in this action item.</p>	<p>Added information to Action 4.16 (formerly 4.17) about drivers of high rent identified in the draft Housing Needs Assessment (VRBOs were not identified as drivers based on my understanding)</p>
<p>QUESTION: We are unclear about the statement "For projects to be eligible for funding, they must be designed to increase capacity and not address a deficiency, unless that deficiency is a direct impediment to economic development." Please provide clarity about this statement in the revised EDE draft.</p>	<p>Edited introduction to "Specific Projects" subsection (p13) to clarify that this is for PFAPP funding specifically. This subsection was included based on a council resolution (https://www.sanjuanco.com/DocumentCenter/View/15151/Resolution-17-2018-Amending-Appendix-A-to-the-Economic-Development-Plan), and the language reflects that document.</p>
<p>We urge the county to remove the second paragraph in this section, which begins with "Old-timers remember when..." This paragraph does not, we believe, provide helpful or meaningful clarity to the key economic opportunities and challenges facing the San Juan County community. If this paragraph is left in the document, the term "Old-timers" should be changed to "long-term residents" or a similar term that is not as likely to cause offense and confusion.</p>	<p>Cut as requested (see Overview section, p15).</p>
<p>Regarding the mention of the county's current decision to not join a local RTPO: this is a forward-thinking visioning document and the county may very well choose to join a RTPO in the future. We'd suggest changing the final sentence on line 24 to reflect this possibility.</p>	<p>Added "at this point in time" (p21, middle)</p>
<p>As part of the San Juan Archipelago, San Juan County has a total area of 621 square miles, of which 174 square miles are land and 447 square miles are marine waters. (See: http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/San_Juan_Archipelago) Note: the "San Juan Islands" are islands in the U.S. in multiple WA State counties. "San Juan County" and "San Juan Islands" are not interchangeable.</p>	<p>Corrected (p21, Transportation Components 2nd paragraph)</p>
<p>The following section is revised to include the 2015 VTRA (Vessel Traffic Risk ...</p>	<p>Updated as requested, with edits for clarity and appropriate, corrected citation & links (see Transportation Components, p21).</p>
<p>Please provide clarity on the phrase "creates an equivalence that can be capitalized on."</p>	<p>Edited for clarity (end of Transportation Components, p22)</p>
<p>We believe that the first full sentence, beginning on line 12 should read "Outside the designated urban growth areas" and not "Inside the designated urban growth areas..."</p>	<p>Corrected</p>
<p>Because of regulatory effectiveness issues and limitations of the county's authority, we suggest changing "Policies should enable county powers to protect wildlife and ecological systems within the county..." to "The county will work within the bounds of state and federal law to implement code that ensures protection of wildlife and ecological systems within the county."</p>	<p>This background section (Accommodations/Dining/Tourism, p24) is not the appropriate place for a policy statement, so their requested addition was put in as a new policy under goal 3 (Policy 3.10).</p>
<p>Please also consider adding in a statement in this section about the benefit to the county of supporting our "scenic byways."</p>	<p>Added language with scenic byways to paragraph 2 of Accommodations/Dining/Toursim, p24.</p>
<p>Please add in a statement about the economic element of shoreline protection, research, and restoration. This work brings jobs and money into the county.</p>	<p>Added statement to Marine Resources section (pp24-25)</p>

August 2, 2019
EDC Changes Requested and Made, 2019

<p>Please summarize the findings here of the "Economic Analysis of Resource Lands" report in this section and include the report in this element's appendix: https://www.sanjuanco.com/DocumentCenter/View/14432/2018-1-2_Natural_Resource_Lands_Analysis-</p>	<p>Added this summary at end of Data & Charts section (p40). Per A. Zack we can include as citation and transmit info to council, rather than appending to document.</p>
<p>Friends of the San Juans strongly agrees with the majority of survey respondents in the preference to prioritize tourism infrastructure over tourism marketing. Please include the full "San Juan Islands Visitor Study" in the appendix to this element of the comprehensive plan: https://www.sanjuanco.com/1391/San-Juan-Islands-Visitor-Study</p>	<p>Per A. Zack we can include as citation and transmit info to council, rather than appending to document.</p>
<p>We ask the county to clarify in this comprehensive plan element, whether or not vacation rentals are commercial in nature and/or urban in nature. Given the large impact that vacation rentals have on both access to affordable housing and economic development, we advocate for vacation rentals being treated as commercial entities under the county comprehensive plan (and thus being discussed explicitly within this Economic Development element as well as in the Housing and Land Use elements of the Comprehensive Plan).</p>	<p>Added a clause to Action 4.16 to study this issue and added a new action (Action 3.26) to provide for addressing it.</p>

<p><i>By phone:</i> requested action to develop/adopt a valuation for natural capital that could be used to assess costs/benefits of protection, etc.</p>	<p>Added action 3.1 about developing a standard for valuation of natural capital</p>
<p>"Effective zoning and permit enforcement mechanisms: for people building or renovating. I think this also applies to vacation rentals. If violators have enough money to pay fines and sue, there is really no way to stop them from doing destructive things."</p>	<p>Added to Action 1.12</p>
<p>"A greater detail developing a baseline of natural capital, which you and I discussed a couple of months ago. I understand that the conservation district has a lot of data or access to a lot of data since soil samples are usually done as part of farm plans. However, it has been noted by the ARC that the NRCS soil maps ... are not accurate at the level needed to effectively plan/manage our resources in San Juan County. A more detailed analysis of our soils would be helpful."</p>	<p>Added to Action 3.12</p>
<p>"Developing a baseline for water measurement. I was talking with one of our County Councilmembers this weekend who agreed we need to have good data on water, and how much we need for the current number of people and visitors on the islands. If there's a way of understanding average gallons/day usage for residents and visitors, that would be super helpful for planning. My understanding is that this doesn't exist now. Please correct me if I am mistaken! "</p>	<p>Added to Action 3.12</p>

<i>In person discussion</i>	Added clause to Policy 4.2 at request of VC after discussing LIFR's suggestions about job training/growth related to emergency preparedness.
<i>In person discussion</i>	Action 4.11 updated to reflect items that would improve workforce resilience after discussing LIFR's question about why victims of assault were included here, and LIFR's request to add mental health and accessible health care. Included OB/prenatal and emergency transport as specific deficiencies that I am aware have adversely affected the local workforce.
<i>In person discussion</i>	Action 4.12 related to Action 4.11: improve resilience of businesses to sudden illness of key personnel.
<i>Added by VC: Add info on ferry ridership</i>	VC added to Paragraph 4 of Overview section
<i>Added by VC: Specify commercial/urban for VRBOs (as per FoSJ)</i>	Added a clause to Action 3.12 to study this issue and added a new action (Action 3.26) to provide for addressing it.
<i>Added by VC: Add to existing action on guest accommodation businesses being prepared to provide for guests: provide similar support for regular staff as well as visitors.</i>	Added to Action 4.13
<i>Added by VC: "experience economy"</i>	VC added to Paragraph 1 of Overview section