

## Adam Zack

---

**From:** Erika Shook  
**Sent:** Friday, May 18, 2018 10:57 AM  
**To:** Comp Plan Update; Adam Zack  
**Subject:** FW: a late comment for the May 18 Comp Plan Vision  
**Attachments:** 2nd comment on 582018 Comp Plan Hearing.odt

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Bill Watson  
**Sent:** Friday, May 18, 2018 10:55 AM  
**To:** Erika Shook <erikas@sanjuanoco.com>; Mike Thomas <miket@sanjuanoco.com>  
**Subject:** FW: a late comment for the May 18 Comp Plan Vision

-----Original Message-----

**From:** sadie b <salim3796@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 18, 2018 10:35 AM  
**To:** DL - Council <Council@sanjuanoco.com>  
**Cc:** Ingrid Gabriel <ingridg@sanjuanoco.com>; Lynda Guernsey <LyndaG@sanjuanoco.com>  
**Subject:** a late comment for the May 18 Comp Plan Vision

Hi Ingrid;

Please put this in the archives or whatever you do with comments received after the comment period - in perpetuity. Also, I would like to send both comments I wrote to the Planning Commission (PC); fully expecting to be ignored, but dutifully expressing my voice as a long time

island resident who has been concerned for decades about the direction our government has taken, as pertains to land use.

Would you please forward yesterday's email and attachments that I sent, to the PC? I see no way to contact them on the SanJuanco website. I'm copying Lynda Guernsey, in hopes that she will send this on to the PC, even though it's too late to be considered for this meeting.

Also: correction on yesterday's submission. I used an acronym for the Development Department that was incorrect. I said CDP instead of CDD or DCC or whatever it is now. It is still disturbing to me, years after their "name change," that Planning was dropped from the department name. It doesn't send a good message to the People. I guess my "error" was an unconscious way to try to put Planning back into that department.

Please note the above-mentioned correction and if possible, add it as a footnote to yesterday's submission. I'm not good with acronyms.

Thanks very much.

To San Juan County Council;

5/18/18

In re-reading the latest Comp Plan Vision, I feel compelled to send a more specific 2nd comment. It's alarming to see that although climate change was mentioned, there is not a specific commitment to protecting our water - our most finite and essential element for all Life.

Protecting our waters needs to be top priority - along with addressing climate change and upholding ecological rights, as I said in my other comment. This means NOT building in wetlands or deforesting the place, or risking our shorelines and nearshore habitats by allowing every parcel to be developed. We need a stormwater filtration system so that we can store and re-use some of the runoff as greywater. Deforesting, creating stormwater issues, then piping it away and dumping it all into the oceans is not a sustainable solution.

You can't separate the 3 above-mentioned things; all are essential for Life to continue. We are in the midst of irreversible climate change. Without total commitment to stewardship of our waters and lands, along with respecting carrying capacity, (we are already well over carrying capacity, should a natural disaster strike), then Joe Symons is right; all this is just window dressing - I would add - on a house burning to the ground.

**Recommendations:**

- 1) include water as its own element to protect and steward; don't give permits where water is scarce. We only have so much water. Deforestation and wetland destruction destroys our natural water supplies.
- 2) include carrying capacity and make the buildout map top priority so we do no further harm. We've done enough stalling and "discussing."
- 3) find more creative and less wasteful/polluting ways to deal with stormwater - think recycling and leaving forests and forested wetlands intact, and restoring damaged ones, especially in and around UGAs where they are most needed.
- 4) Fines. It is far cheaper for people to build, un-permitted, and get their project "approved" - example, Steve Pearson and Craftsmen Corner and the precedent THAT set! A hand-slap fine is a joke, at best. There are stiffer fines for first-time violators of the "*peddler's ordinance*" The focus *must* be on enforcement on violators. These tiny fines are meaningless: \$1000 a day for non-compliance by repeat violators would get their attention - not a one-time *maximum* fine of \$1000.

B. Sadie Bailey