

Adam Zack

From: joe symons <joesymons@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 15, 2018 12:04 PM
To: Comp Plan Update; Lynda Guernsey; DL - Council
Subject: Comments regarding the 2nd draft of the SJC Vision Statement

To: SJC Planning Commission

From: Joe Symons

Date: 15 March 2018

Re: Staff findings re 2nd Draft of SJC Vision Statement

I write to express my concern that the public input to the 2nd Draft of the SJC Vision Statement has been substantially ignored by DCD staff. I urge you to investigate how and why so much valuable input was disregarded.

Second, as noted previously, the Vision Statement is not simply some fluff that helps readers feel good about the future intentions and directions of SJC. It has (or is supposed to have) agency. It is the "foundation of the Comp Plan". Presumably "foundation" does not mean sand. It means re-bar infused highest standard concrete, something built to last, which implies a large "safety factor" as an engineer would say. It does not mean "minimum specs" but "best of class".

As SJC proceeds with its CP update, the county and its residents have an opportunity to set a new bar, an unprecedented standard, for not just writing, but creating and implementing, a truly sustainable Plan-oriented county. Sweep away the smoke and mirrors of the current (and about to be revised) Vision Statement and you find that what has agency here in SJC is the market, not the CP nor the Vision upon which it is supposed to be built.

It will be a useless exercise if we polish a gold-plated apple and ignore that it is entirely hollow. You have the opportunity to participate in making this apple whole. Please take that opportunity.

Background:

On 5 March 2018, I sent the following email to Adam Zach and cc'd to the PC administrator:

On the transmittal letter, page 1, of

<https://www.sanjuanco.com/DocumentCenter/View/14542>

staff states that there were several factors that influenced their decisions re updating the vision statement.

These included:

"narrowly defined scope for refining the vision"

and

"Planning Commission direction provided at their January 19, 2018 meeting"

Please send me all information you have regarding these factors, and any other considerations you used to propose the changes you made re the 2nd draft.

Page 2, "Background", lines 28-37 implies that considerable attention was made to public comments on the first draft.

As my initial read of the staff changes suggests that almost no substantive changes were made, in contrast to the many thoughtful and supportive changes suggested by the public, I'd very much welcome knowing staff's decision making process. The "staff analysis" section does not adequately explain the exclusion of the vast majority of public input on this second draft.

Joe Symons
Olga, WA

No response was received from Adam nor from Erika in a followup email to her dated 8 March 2018.

I will not be able to attend the PC meeting on this topic scheduled for tomorrow 16 March 2018. Consequently I include my comments below:

The document referenced in the link above is 66 pages long. Of these, 38 pages (almost 60%) are public comment, containing specific language suggestions and explanations for those suggestions. The approximate number of words specifically recommended to be added to the Vision statement by the public is 923. The actual number of words added by staff is 54 (as shown by the yellow "highlights".) Of those 54, 33 are in one entry, by Friends of the San Juans, regarding "Governance". That is, about 6% of the suggested additions were added, and of those 6%, almost 4%, from FOSJ were regarding cooperating with other governments. One change made by staff was to replace the word "farming" with "agriculture". One was to remove "A.D." from the Preamble.

Specifically, the following sections of the Vision Statement showed some change. If the section is not listed, no changes were suggested regardless of public input:

Section	words added
Preamble	1
Basic Needs	2
Economy	replace one word
Natural Environment	6
Energy	3
Governance	33
Climate Change	9

Critical suggestions were ignored without any explanation.

I urge you to review public suggestions with care and add them in or obtain reasonable arguments for why they were disregarded.

I have no staff nor resources to offer a "revised 2nd draft" of the Vision Statement for you to review and compare with that created by staff. I imagine you are as busy as everyone, so the default action is simply to accept the staff recommendations and move on. For the benefit of the county and yourselves as residents, I hope you do not simply pass on this opportunity. By metaphor, "War is too serious a matter to entrust to military men." https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Georges_Clemenceau

SJC has the opportunity to be proactive. Please take it.

Joe Symons
Olga WA