

Adam Zack

From: Fred Klein <freddythek10@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 9, 2018 8:40 PM
To: Joe Symons
Cc: Timothy P. Blanchard; Pete Moe; Comp Plan Update; DL - Council; Deborah Hopkins/San Juan Islands Visitors Bureau; Natalie Menacho; Keara Axelrod; Sam Dillingham; Margie Doyle; Janet Alderton; Sarah Ross
Subject: Re: Vacation Rental Permits Issued in SJC 1990-2017 annually

nice work Joe...hope you get some PC support on this...F.

On Dec 9, 2018, at 7:16 PM, joe symons <joesymons@me.com> wrote:

SJC GIS data (see attached pdf for reference) shows 1050 Vacation Rental Permits (VRPs) issued in the time period 1990-2017

The attached excel chart shows the trend in the approval of VRPs

<Vacation rental permits per year.pdf>

There is no easy way to determine the number of bedrooms assigned to any given permit.

SJC's GIS disclaimer includes "This is not an exhaustive list of permits and there may be vacation rental permits not shown on the map. This map does not include permits for hotels, motels, resorts, or bed and breakfasts."

The attached map shows the location of VRPs (jpg clip from SJC GIS VRP Open Data)

<Vacation_Rental_Permits.jpg>

It is my understanding that the recently approved modifications to the VRP regulations do not restrict the number of VRPs that may be issued, either by island or by location on island (rural, waterfront, activity center, etc.).

To my knowledge there has been no informed conversation regarding the impact of visitors and possible regulations/restrictions on visitor accommodations. Visitor impacts are not reviewed or part of the GMA CP update process, I believe the county owes the residents (read: voters) a serious opportunity to discuss the clearly-growing challenges and impacts of visitors and the options available to manage these impacts consistent with a vision statement that calls for a rural, slow, quiet, "isolated nature" that is the reason most residents have moved here and wish to stay here. The "Nantucket Study", done for SJC in 2000, is neither mentioned nor available on the county's web site. You can read it at

<http://www.doebay.net/appeal/socioeconomicgrowth.pdf>

As noted in the cover letter to the study, SJC was (in 2000) considered exactly on track to be like other resort communities like Nantucket and Aspen. Just 20 years behind. It is now almost 20 years after the study was done.

Visitors do not come here to be in crowds; their experience is contingent on the consistency of the marketing with the reality. Let's not kill the goose that lays the golden egg (easy to say: the reality is that we are. Talk is cheap. Where's the walk?)

I spoke with our state Senator who lives on Orcas regarding the crowding in Eastsound in the summer. He told me he does not come to Eastsound between April and October because of the crowds. Anyone who lives here knows what the ferries, parks, roads, water (wells) and towns are like during the peak months. The visitor accommodation trend line, shown in the attached pdf, is not level or downward.

I urge readers and decision makers to speak up regarding the trend lines and impacts that this data reveals. San Juan County should not be "for sale". It should not be a vehicle for privatizing public assets, certainly not without serious and considerable public discussion.

Joe Symons
Olga WA

Data anomalies and confusions:

86 of 1050 permits have no approval date / 40 have approved status but no approval date

83 have a status other than approved, such as denied, withdrawn, unknown, pending, deactivated

Permit Type bounces all over the map in terms of field value

Permit Number format has changed and the data is commingled

Field "description" is not defined and appears either arbitrary or variable

It appears that the vast majority of VRPs are to a single entity (household)

the address field does not include the zip code

there is no island field to allow analysis of growth trends by island.

—

carpe diem