

Donna DePamphilis

From: joe symons <joesymons@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 1, 2017 1:52 PM
To: Linda Ann Kuller; Erika Shook; Bill Watson; Rick Hughes; Jamie Stephens
Cc: Stephanie Buffum; Lynn Bahrych; Maile Johnson; fred klein; Learner Limbach
Subject: Re: Meeting on comp plan background today

Tis a new year and one in which I hope a wise approach to the CP revision process will occur. I write to thank you for the handouts that you gave me at our meeting on 13 December 2016 a few weeks ago. I note that Appendix A was not included. I found the following on the county's web site:

<http://sanjuanco.com/DocumentCenter/Home/View/10785>

I assume this is Appendix A. Please confirm.

For reference, you gave me appendices B, C, D and Resolution 21 - 2016

I am particularly concerned that the process by which Section 1 / Consistency (page 3 of Appendix A) will be dealt with. I note with some relief that "further review needed" has been checked for all items (a, b, c).

If you have read my first [brief](#) challenging the 1998 CP, you'll see that the umbrella of my strategy was a consistency argument. We read on page one of the [Introduction to the CP](#) the following:

"The Vision Statement (Table 1) is the foundation upon which the entire Comprehensive Plan is based."

Page 2 of the CP shows the Vision Statement.

I believe there still exists a serious inconsistency between the CP's actual growth potential of SJC's future and the Vision as adopted and approved by the BOCC and which, I believe, is still valid in the hearts and minds of the citizens of SJC.

I note that there appears to be zero discussion of buildout in Section 1- Land Use Element (page 1 of Appendix B) nor in any other element of Appendix B.

In short, while the location, size, color, shape and variety of deck chairs of the Titanic are going to be discussed, I do not see anywhere a discussion of the direction of the ship.

Given that the process used to craft the original density maps, in 1979, was flawed, and that the BOCC prohibited the discussion of density in the revision of the CP beginning in 1992 (triggering a flock of lawsuits on various topics, most of which SJC lost), absent a clear and intentional conversation about density in this revision, the consistency red flag will again come out of the ref's back pocket.

The first FDO by the WWGMHB (21 July 1999) noted the following:

"Intervenor Symons correctly pointed out that the maps were also significantly inconsistent with the vision statement set forth as the guiding principle for the CP. These inconsistencies, caused by the retention of 1980 densities, do not comply with the GMA."

These inconsistencies have not been resolved. The CP is non-compliant with GMA.

I don't believe it is too late to raise the bar on the strategic CP rewrite process; if no where else, it would be via the consistency section as noted above.

However, that approach is procedural and technical and could wind its way toward litigation. It would be *so much better* if this topic were put on the table, up front, right now, big time, pretty much in accord with my January 2001 request to the planning commission, which you can read here.

<http://doebay.net/forthcoming.html>

As noted, the PC unanimously supported this request

<http://www.doebay.net/SJC%20PC%20findings%20Oct%202001.pdf>

which was ignored by the BOCC.

It's time to get real. At a minimum respond immediately to the PC's recommendation on my request, and go big here. Do it right. Make it clear. Get it out there. The fundamentals haven't changed (much) since 1979, and they were simply wrong. You have the power, the ability, and the moral authority and obligation to do this.

Please do it.

Happy New Year! We might not be able to do much about the other Washington, but, as the bumper sticker says, "we do it differently here than on the mainland."

And we should.

Joe Symons
Olga, WA

On Dec 14, 2016, at 10:56 AM, Linda Ann Kuller <lindak@sanjuanco.com> wrote:

Our pleasure, thank you for making the trip over.
Linda

From: joe symons [<mailto:joesymons@me.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 7:52 PM

To: Erika Shook <erikas@sanjuanco.com>; Linda Ann Kuller <lindak@sanjuanco.com>

Cc: fred klein <fklein@orcasonline.com>

Subject: Meeting on comp plan background today

Thanks to both of you for taking the time to listen and react to a couple of codgers who went thru the last fun and games in which the county chose to avoid doing the right comp plan thing. I am really hoping that this time the right questions will be asked and the hard challenging process of crafting intelligent, wise and mature answers will be used.

...

carpe diem