

Appendix A

Guemes Island Planning Survey

Rate of return is 46 %

Number of respondents N=511

Questions 1-3 ask about how you value the social and physical qualities of Guemes Island

1. How valuable are the following attributes of island living to you?

	<i>Missing</i>	<i>Very</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	
a. Strong community involvement	1.4	40.9	46.8	11.0	%
b. Neighborliness	1.0	64.4	32.1	2.5	
c. Sense of safety	0.6	72.6	23.5	3.3	
d. Wide range of community activities	1.2	22.7	55.4	20.7	
e. Sense of belonging	0.8	43.1	46.8	9.4	
f. Current level of law enforcement	4.3	34.2	47.7	13.7	
g. Socio-economic diversity	2.3	31.1	37.6	29.0	
h. Investment opportunity	2.0	10.0	32.7	55.4	

2. How valuable are the following elements of the island's physical environment to you?

	<i>Missing</i>	<i>Very</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	
a. Open fields/pastures	0.2	76.9	19.6	3.3	%
b. Wooded areas	0.2	85.9	12.1	1.8	
c. Roadside hedgerows	2.0	50.1	29.9	18.0	
d. Wetlands	1.8	70.5	20.4	7.4	
e. Undeveloped shorelines	1.4	78.5	14.9	5.3	
f. Open vistas	1.2	74.4	19.6	4.9	
g. Wildlife	0.8	74.6	20.0	4.7	
h. Rustic walking trails	1.4	55.8	30.1	12.7	
i. Public shoreline access	0.6	64.2	24.3	11.0	

3. How important are the following aspects of the island's rural character to you?

	<i>Missing</i>	<i>Very</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	
a. Rural character of roads	1.2	69.3	25.0	4.5	%
b. Scale of commercial enterprises	1.8	63.4	22.5	12.3	
c. Pace of life	1.0	76.5	16.8	5.7	
d. Sense of privacy	0.8	84.3	13.1	1.8	
e. Quiet	0.2	89.2	9.2	1.4	
f. Rural landscape	0.4	82.0	14.9	2.7	
g. Air quality	0.8	90.6	6.7	2.0	
h. Water quality	0.8	92.4	5.5	1.4	
i. Light pollution	3.3	73.2	17.4	6.1	

Questions 4 through 7 ask your general views about growth on Guemes Island.

4. Overall, do you think the extent of development on Guemes Island in the last few years has made it a more desirable or less desirable place for you to live? (Mark one)

Missing	3.5
A. More desirable	10.0 %
B. About the same	36.2
C. Less desirable	43.1
D. Unsure	4.3
E. No opinion	2.9

5. The following are potential outcomes that could accompany growth on the island. How desirable or un-desirable is each of the following for you personally? (Mark all)

	Missing	Desirable	Neutral	Undesirable
a. Private roads widened and/or hard-surfaced	0.8	4.9	36.4	57.9 %
b. Public roads widened	1.4	9.0	26.2	63.4
c. Island bus/van service	0.6	31.1	38.2	30.1
d. Island-based law enforcement	1.0	21.1	41.1	36.8
e. Professional fire protection	1.0	17.8	47.0	34.2
f. Senior assisted living	1.2	18.0	43.6	37.2
g. Loss of open space	1.2	3.1	13.9	81.8
h. Increased residential development	1.6	2.9	24.3	71.2
i. Increased commercial development	1.0	2.7	13.3	83.0
j. Taxpayer-funded Library District	1.6	22.3	35.2	40.9

6. Are there reasons associated with development that would lead you to move away from Guemes Island? (Mark all that apply)

a. Not applicable, I do not reside even part-time on the island	10.0 %
b. No, I would not consider moving because of growth	29.9
c. Deterioration of environmental quality	50.3
d. Deterioration drinking water supply	49.7
e. Loss of sense of community	26.2
f. Too many people	51.5
g. Too many houses	46.0
h. Too much traffic	51.3
i. Loss of sense of safety	49.5
j. Loss of sense of privacy	49.9
k. Length of commute time to Anacortes	17.2
l. Other, please specify on comment section	2.9

7. Planning sometimes requires trade-offs between individual development rights and the community's right to preserve its character. On a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is "development rights are most important" and 10 is "preservation rights are most important," which number best characterizes your values?

Missing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	%
1.2%	3.1	1.8	4.3	2.9	13.3	6.3	11.2	16.8	11.4	27.8	

The next questions ask what kind of growth and related issues you would like to see happen on Guemes Island (not what you think is most likely or inevitable).

8. The current growth rate on Guemes Island is 20% in the last 10 years (approximately 100 people from 1990 to 2000 or 2% per year) What do you consider to be the desirable rate of population change on the island? (Mark one)

Missing	1.2	%
A. Current growth rate is fine	22.3	
B. Slower growth rate than the last 10 years	42.1	
C. Faster growth rate than the last 10 years	2.2	
D. Zero or negative growth rate (constant)	26.6	
E. Negative growth rate (decreasing population)	5.7	

9. Would you like to see more or less of the following on the island? (Mark each as)

	Missing	More	Same	Less	%
a. Farming	1.8	36.6	59.3	2.3	
b. Quarrying	2.7	1.2	48.7	47.4	
c. Aquaculture	4.1	8.2	41.9	45.8	
d. Cottage industries	2.2	28.2	52.3	17.4	
e. Bed and breakfast	2.5	20.7	55.6	21.1	
f. Boat launch	2.3	29.5	59.5	8.6	
g. Utility, Wind or Cell towers	5.3	22.1	41.1	31.5	
h. Ferry parking	2.5	51.1	42.7	3.7	
i. Restaurant	3.3	13.1	58.7	24.9	
j. Tourism	2.5	3.7	39.9	53.8	
k. Stores	2.3	6.5	66.9	24.3	
l. Youth programs	6.5	26.6	58.1	8.8	
m. Senior daycare	7.8	25.8	53.2	13.1	
n. Other, please specify on comment section	93.2	2.2	2.5	2.2	

10 Should construction guidelines for new and remodeling projects be revised to include any of the following? (Mark all that you support)

a. Provide green buffer (hedgerow, native vegetation, or lawn) between new houses and road	57.9	%
b. Encourage siting building at the edge of parcel rather than in the center	13.5	
c. Restrict clearing of trees when building	48.9	
d. Restrict construction of impervious surfaces	57.3	
e. Fewer restrictions should be imposed	15.3	
f. Limit proportion of lot that can be filled by man-made structures	50.9	
g. No expansion of original footprint in remodeling structures near shorelines or other sensitive areas.	42.5	

11. Are you satisfied with the current status of outdoor storage in view from roads or neighboring properties? (Mark one)

Missing	3.1	%
A. Yes	20.0	
B. No.	12.5	
C. Unsure	48.3	
D. No opinion	16.0	

Current standards for private roadways are: a minimum width of 12 ft driving surface if serving up to two dwellings and 20 ft if it serves more than two dwellings. The wider roads provide easy access for emergency vehicles, but increase water run-off.

12. Are you in favor of allowing more than 2 lots to be served by the narrower roads?(Mark one)

Missing	0.6	%
A. Yes	57.3	
B. No	14.7	
C. Unsure	16.8	
D. No opinion	10.6	

13. Should Guemes Island form a tax-payer funded Park District for purchase of land for parks, trails, boat launch or other public use? (Mark one)

Missing	0.2	%
A. Yes	29.4	
B. No	44.4	
C. Unsure	22.1	
D. No opinion	3.9	

14. When growth and development come to a community, new infrastructure and services are needed (for example, more ferry parking, better roads, fire, police, island-wide public water system) In your opinion, who should pay for the expansion of services required by new development? (Mark one)

Missing	1.6	%
A. Current residents (taxpayers) should pay these costs	2.3	
B. New owners should pay	40.9	
C. Both current residents and new owners should share the cost	44.8	
D. Unsure	8.2	
E. No opinion	2.2	

15. Understanding that this process may take several years, would you like to see a moratorium on the issuing of new land subdivision permits on Guemes Island while the Sub-Area Plan is being developed? (Mark one)

Missing	1.2	%
A. Yes	66.9	
B. No	20.4	
C. Unsure	9.2	
D. No opinion	2.3	

Our community will be influenced by the type of development that is permitted by county rules. The next questions ask your views about some county rules for development.

16 Do you support the idea of additional commercial zoning on the island included in the subarea plan? (Mark one)

Missing	0.8	%
A. Expansion of existing commercial area near ferry dock	15.7	
B. Developing a new commercial area elsewhere	2.5	
A+B. Both areas	1.4	
C. No	69.5	
D. Unsure	8.2	
E. No opinion	2.0	

17. Current law permits land to be developed so that residences are clustered on smaller lots, leaving large amounts of property undeveloped. Do you favor or oppose this clustering approach? (Mark one)

Missing	0.8	%
A. Favor	48.7	
B. Oppose	22.7	
C. Unsure	22.5	
D. No opinion	5.3	

18. In the case of clustered development, should the large open space area be set aside for future development or should it be permanently protected? (Mark one)

Missing	2.2	%
A. Future Development	5.9	
B. Conservation Easement	75.9	
C. Unsure	12.5	
D. No opinion	3.5	

19. Would you support spending property tax dollars to purchase development rights? (Mark one)

Missing	2.5	%
A. Strongly support	15.5	
B. Support	22.7	
C. Do not support	38.2	
if you answered C. or D., please skip the next question		
D. Unsure	21.1	

20. In order to preserve land as stated in question 20, how much of a property tax increase would you be willing to support? (Mark one)

Missing	51.5	%
A property rate increase of:		
A. \$5.00 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation	15.1	
B. \$10.00 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation	17.2	
C. \$25.00 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation	11.0	
D. More than \$25.00 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation	5.3	

The next questions relate to transportation.

21. Should public roads and traffic be changed for improved safety and, if so, how? (Mark all that you support)

a. Public roads are safe enough now	50.3	%
b. Set maximum speed limit to 25 mph for entire island	20.9	
c. Keep current speed limits on public roads	46.4	
d. Widen extra narrow roads minimally where visibility is limited	26.6	
e. Widen all public roads minimally	3.9	
f. Widen all public roads substantially	2.0	

22. Do you support new provisions for pedestrians or bicyclists and, if so, what? (Mark all that you support)

a. No new provisions are needed	57.3	%
b. Add new road shoulders for trails along only the most dangerous public roads	18.2	
c. Add new road shoulders for trails along all public roads	8.4	
d. Add trails buffered from most dangerous public roads (as by drainage ditch)	11.0	
e. Add trails buffered from all public roads (as by drainage ditch)	3.9	
f. Add special walking and biking trails not necessarily associated with roadways	16.6	

Professional consulting services are needed in order to prepare a Sub-Area Plan that is consistent with the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan. Skagit County is at this time not in a position to provide a consultant's fees. Some funds have been granted, but not sufficient to complete the project.

23. Would you support fund-raising through on-island donations to continue the Guemes Island Planning Advisory Committee's planning effort? (Mark one)

Missing	1.2	%
A. Yes	57.9	
B. No	17.8	
C. Unsure	17.6	
D. No opinion	5.5	

It is important to know how well all groups on the island are represented by those who respond to the survey. The following demographic questions are for statistical purposes only; all of your answers will remain anonymous. The more of these questions you answer, the better we can tell how well survey results represent the whole range of Islander's views.

24. How involved are you in community activities or organizations (e.g. Community Center, Fire Hall, GIPOA, CERT, Women's Club, etc.)? (Mark one)

Missing	1.6	%
A. Very	10.4	
B. Somewhat	38.6	
C. Not at all	49.5	

25. I am: (Mark one)

Missing	1.8	%
A. Resident, own a home	62.4	
B. Resident, do not own a home	4.3	
C. Non-resident, owner of undeveloped property	10.6	
D. Non-resident, owner of developed property	20.9	

26. What percentage of the time do you reside on Guemes Island annually? (Mark the one that best applies)

Missing	2.5	%
A. 0-25%	30.9	
B. 26%-50%	13.7	
C. 51%-75%	7.4	
D. 76%-100%	45.4	

27. How much land do you own on Guemes Island? (Mark one)

Missing	2.0	%
A. None	3.3	
B. Less than 1 acre	32.7	
C. 1 to less than 6 acres	38.2	
D. 6 to less than 20 acres	15.3	
E. 20 acres or more	8.6	

28. How many years have you been a resident of Guemes Island?

Missing	2.5	%
A. None	11.9	
B. Up to 5 years	16.4	
C. 5 to 10 years	16.4	
D. 10 to 20 years	24.1	
E. More than 20 years	28.6	

29. What is your age group?

Missing	3.5	%
A. 20 or under	0.6	
B. 21 to 34	2.9	
C. 35 to 49	14.7	
D. 50 to 64	44.2	
E. 65 or older	34.1	

30. What is your highest level of education? (Mark one)

Missing	6.1	%
A. High school or less	5.5	
B. Some college or technical school	14.5	
C. 2 year degree	5.3	
D. 4 year degree	32.5	
E. Advanced degree	36.2	

31. How many children do you have in each school-age category?

	<i>None</i>	<i>One</i>	<i>Two</i>	<i>Three</i>	<i>Four+</i>
A. Preschool	97.8	2.0	0.2	0	0
B. Elementary	94.5	3.9	1.4	0.2	0
C. Middle School	95.1	4.3	0.6	0	0
D. High School	93.3	5.5	1.0	0	0.2
E. College	89.8	7.4	2.2	0.6	0

32. What is your employment status? (Mark one)

Missing	4.5	%
A. Self-employed	20.7	
B. Full-time employee	21.1	
C. Part-time employee	7.2	
D. Retired	43.8	
E. Other	2.5	

33. What portion of your income is from work performed on Guemes Island?

Missing	5.9	%
A. None	79.1	
B. Less than half	8.2	
C. More than half, but not all	4.1	
D. All	2.7	

34. What is your household gross annual income?

Missing	18.4	%
A. less than \$17,500	4.5	
B. \$17,501 - \$32,000	8.0	
C. \$32,001 - \$43,000	9.2	
D. \$43,001 - \$75,000	24.3	
E. \$75,001 - \$120,000	20.5	
F. in excess of \$120,000	15.1	

Analysis by Rebecca Paskind
 Compiled by Marianne Kooiman
 October 2, 2004

GIPAC Written Survey Comments

Case

General Comments

7 Looking back over my more than forty years of association with Guemes Island I have fit into each of the survey's resident categories at one time or another (Q25). Here is what is important to me: minimize the rate of taxation on the property I own, and maximize my right to do what I want to/with/and on my property with the least amount of bureaucratic interference.

To those individuals who would like to halt all development on the island I would say: raise your money on your own, stay out of my wallet (tax-payer funded) and purchase all the land that is available and set it aside undeveloped "forever". You pay for our island property now, and all the future costs associated with owning the property, then do with it exactly as you desire. After all that is precisely what I have been doing for decades. (Signed, Thomas Deutsch)

17 I don't care to pay higher property taxes to be wasted for higher consultation fees for the ridiculous ferry ticket and the blue and red tickets that you need another employee to collect. Do you need a consultant to figure this out? Anybody can do better even you. Now I know why I'm voting for Tim Eymans 25% tax cut.

19 Would love to see all beaches public.

20 GIPAC is doing a good job. I thank you. I know it is a lot of work.

23 Would like to see recycle bins on the island.

25 Some of the questions on this survey are a prime example why there are way too many committees on Guemes Island. We would like full time law enforcement on the island. It would detour our wide-range vandalism problem as well as, ticketing and towing. Vehicles would then not be permitted to be left in the ferry line the night before, but would instead have to abide by the same common courtesy rules as the rest of us. If Guemes Island committees would like to gather information through these surveys then they should be responsible for the cost (i.e. envelopes, postage) instead of the county-wide tax payers. We would like to have a later weekday ferry, so that the children can participate in after school activities. Certain groups on this island are denying children their right to participate in the after-school activities.

Why are the same questions printed on both sides of this survey? Is this so you can simply fill in the answers how you want us to? How ethical is this?

34 Would hate to see the ambiance change but recognize the need for increased services, i.e. water and sewer, and inevitability of some development.

40 Last page of survey wasn't included in packet. Free enterprise and "best and highest use of land should rule – don't need more government interfering with private property ownership.

41 I am extremely concerned about water on the island – especially with regard to a new well on North Beach with the potential of destroying existing wells.

43 We have completed this survey even tho we thought that many of the questions + choices were heading. Thank you.

45 We highly approve of the Anderson store, not too happy with large home with mult. baths when we wish to conserve water.

46. I'd like to see 5-acre minimum in order to build a house and NO tourist encouragement.

50 Our property is a stewardship Tree Farm on 6729 West Shore Drive. Work and ownership are shared by parent and two grown children. Property is worked on all year long. Income will come many years later as timber matures. However, Tree Farms need year-round work performed on site by family members.

54 Thanks, S.H.C.

- 59 I would like to see more attention paid to the water situation – both in quality + quantity – this is a huge + growing problem on Guemes (signed G.D. Shannon)
- 64, 65 Too many trucks and construction equipment plying the roads of Guemes Island and at excessive speeds
- 74 1. Leave the ferry schedule alone. 2. Stop deer hunting. 3. Start coyote hunting.
- 86 How does one improve on paradise???
- 94 Please help to keep to country lifestyle alive and well on the island. It would be sad to see one of the last Western Washington rural lands go the way of the rich people's development.
- 134 The only persons who should vote on anything on Guemes Is. Should own property
- 161 Dear GIPAC Thanks for your hard work. It is much appreciated.
- 167 In general, a very well designed survey! Please note my comments for future surveys. We need a bigger ferry boat but keep the SAME SCHEDULE!! We need to triple run the 6:30 thru 8:30 AM boats M->Friday to better accommodate people commuting to work (i.e. continuous run rather than waiting for the ½ hour) Hope that makes sense.
- 171 I would like to see much greater opportunities on Guemes for exploring/developing co-housing community(s) (eco-villages, community garden, vehicle-sharing, tool-sharing) etc...ideas that take the residential cluster element to a new, more supportive sustainable level. Resources Co-housing Network (www.cohousing.org) and Ecovillage Network of the Americas (ena.ecovillage.org) I would be interested in helping explore this – Lea 299-8551
- 176 As societies' needs change, rules should change. We can't predict the future too well.. Sunset clause on development rules needed.
- 183 Growth/development on this small island causes diverse and difficult impacts (adverse) on many levels. I feel that environmental impact statements must be part of every application for new buildings of any kind. How many cement, lumber, asphalt, gravel, etc. trucks will travel on the ferry? How much water will be consumed? How many extra vehicles, etc.? Any issues warranting/inviting public Comment need to be advertised in large print on sandwich boards by the ferry (such as for the recent name change of Paradise Lane to South Beach Lane) not posted in small type up high where the notice cannot be seen or read in depth.
- 199 In general, a very slanted survey. There will be much flack over this – for those of us that lean toward environment-sensitive issues – it's fine. The rest of Guemes that don't have our views will protest. Sorry I did not respond to original rough draft.
- 210 Owner's son, trustor, says "greed and insensitive growth has reduced the quality of life to the extreme in a place once tranquil and beautiful Orange Cnty, CA". Watch for developer's "shills" and their supported candidates/ reps.
- 217 I would like to see a small marina for Guemes Island (only for property owners). This will produce good income & give property owners more flex to main land
- 228 Having a postage-paid return envelope would have been a welcomed courtesy
- 234 We need white lines in the middle of our roads in the Holiday area. I've never understood why they stop at the big intersection of So. Shore Rd and Holiday, upper and lower.
- 259 We need fewer "junk yards" on this island. I would define a junk yard as more than two unregistered inoperable vehicles per lot or more than three boats that are nor seaworthy. All homes (places inhabited by humans) should have minimal sanitation facilities (no outhouse, no gray water run-off etc.). Grazing cattle fine now, but shouldn't be increased.
- 263 Nightly ferries PLEASE!
- 270 The manner in which many of the above questions have been "loaded" to create a "desired" expression of opinion is quite obvious. If this questionnaire was prepared and approved by all of the current GIPAC members, it serves to expose a collective attitude that is neither

realistic nor in the best long-range interest of most owners of Guemes Island property. If the expressed attitudes and recommendations of GIPAC serve to sacrifice individual property owners' rights and, instead, support social-engineering development "fads", both ownership satisfaction and individual property value appreciation will suffer greatly.

A good starting point for constructive GIPAC deliberation would be consideration of the following:

1. True "Rural Character" has already given way to a suburban atmosphere. Further efforts to reverse this change, though admirable, are destined to fail.
2. Guemes Island will eventually be annexed to Anacortes. Little interest has been expressed in establishing a separate political entity. Community "clubs" and citizen advisory committees often fail to adequately and impartially communicate the needs and opinions of the citizens they claim to represent. Frequently, these groups are manipulated by elected officials and their staff members and serve to insulate the responsible elected officials from their constituents.
3. The present quality of Guemes Island infrastructure ranges from poor to non-existent. We pay for much better than we receive. Planning will have to recognize the fact that "rural character" may be synonymous with a failed water supply, slow emergency response times or poorly constructed streets and roads, for example.
4. Guemes Island is a very nice place to live. Many others will become aware of this fact and they will come to join us. Or, if you prefer, YOU CAN'T STOP DEVELOPMENT!!! You can guide it carefully and do so without interfering with individual development rights. Set your sights on MERCER ISLAND, not on ALCATRAZ.

276 Would like both (1) earlier and later ferry service 7 days a week or (2) public docks on Guemes and Anacortes to facilitate personal/individual transportation. I'd prefer # 2.

279 Thank you!

291 Committees can become a "hammer looking for a nail that needs pounding". The GIPAC needs to be careful not to interfere with property owners rights or to start mandating too much of island way of life. Diversity is important, along with freedom to enjoy Guemes according to style. That may include reclusive lifestyles or community involvement. We use the island as a retreat so privacy and quiet are important to us.

296 This questionnaire is the camel's nose under the tent; and you poor dupes on the advisory committee are the camel herders, you go into the process thinking you are going to manage growth and in the end you will try and cram it down our throats. Signed.....

299 Ferry + ferry schedule: when people move onto Guemes, they know the ferry has a schedule + that schedule provides Guemes property owners ample flexibility – it's a conscious decision we all made + it (current schedule) fits us well – we don't need new folks telling us it needs to change!

315 Keep up the good work!

320 Thank you to all who put this together! It is a very smart idea and I hope it makes a huge difference in our island community. We believe this whole island is sacred space and should be treated in that love and respect. Thank you again, Jessica Snelson and Aaron Peterson.

322 A change in ferry schedule to add scheduled run after 6 pm Mon to Thurs. should not be considered until the sub-area planning for Guemes is approved. The county should support GIPAC funding need in accordance with the GMA.

327 Thanks for doing this survey!

332 GIPAC would be well advised to read and study the WA Growth Management Act + Skagit County Planning Elements. Then perhaps your survey might include questions of real imports, v.s. roadside shrubbery (2©).

333 Where are the questions on Sewer? The water questions are inadequate. This survey is clearly aimed at "Social Engineering" not "Land Use Planning." Many of the questions have nothing to do with the WA GMA. Many are illegal for the government to ask. This survey is also not scientific or a valid reflection of issues of land use planning.

337 Questions related to taxes/development need some further info in order to make good call on answers. General comment: property owners and not renters should decide any and all issues on planning on Guemes!!

341 I find your survey extremely biased and your motivation dubious at best. Suggestion: If something is working, don't fix it! Let an island be an island. Leave the city mentality in the city! Guemes Island only has two "glaring" problems: (1) water and (2) transportation. Think about it!

365 The single most important element for the future is preserving a good water supply from limited aquifers. No commercial or large-scale development should be allowed to exhaust the limited resource. We may already be near the limit for water wells, and county should carefully consider water limits in issuing new permits. See question 3, 6 (d) and 16.

387 Thanks, GIPAC, for all your hard work and this excellently designed survey, J.H.

392 As a general comment: Guemes is a great place + should be maintained in its present state to the greatest extent possible.

393 Non-(summer)-resident owners pay the same rate of real estate property taxes, supporting Skagit County and the ferry, as full-time residents. The car tickets should be valid for 6 months, or 1 year. The store is a good asset of the Island + it saves a lot of ferry crossings.

399 Please improve the posting of public shoreline access that folks can use + include all accesses on island – many are not known + not used – some are blocked.

400 Present ferry system would be inadequate to support any great population increase.

401 We came to Guemes Island because of its bedroom type of living and fear that a population- increase or more commercial development would detract from this living style.

405 What are the "real" questions? Who chose this approach? Your questions are irrelevant, insulting and totally worded towards non-answers. This was a poor questionnaire and a waste of money and time. It does reflect the "new" mental attitude towards Guemes Society, however.

406 Great idea –good survey – would like to see a more diverse group in the GIPAC committee – more youth, more laughter and joy of feeling things are moving to the right directions.

419 I believe one of the most important issues related to further development and density is the availability of water. The first question is how much water is available and of what quality. Given that there is already salt water intrusion on several locations further demands on water significantly impacts both long-term and new residents.

441 Please preserve the uniqueness of Guemes. Developments, like the one by Anderson's store, are really out of character on the island. Those people, who have chosen to live on Guemes year-round should have the biggest say; they have adapted their lifestyle to the island, not the other way around. We love beautiful Guemes Island just the way it is!

442 It seems to me that Skagit County cares little about what happens on Guemes Isl. Egregious examples of dubious permitting are continually noticed by me and others. When one makes an effort to follow "the rules", it is very frustrating to see others get by with very selfish activities. Oh well, it won't be too many years before some of these properties will be washed into the sea!

453 1. Commercial development of any type should be environmentally friendly and benefit Guemes.

2. A position of island "Mayor" or official to coordinate island activities with county + other outside entities might be helpful. This would be a person one could bring ideas to, to be disseminated.

3. An island-wide site for exchange of articles for trade or sale or free.

471,472 We (my wife and I) believe "sustainable development" is not an oxymoron and are in favor of a sub-area plan that promotes this concept. We would encourage Skagit County to adopt policies that support the rural character and diverse population of Guemes Island. We would also encourage County officials to directly inform island property owners of new policies affecting them. Members of GIPAC have developed a thoughtful survey – everybody's ox gets gored a little – and we expect those individuals writing the sub-area plan to study the comments generated by this survey.

465 I would like the development plan to prevent residential rental property from turning into commercial rental property such as "Agate Cove" at 5944 W. Shore Rd (see attached). During the summer months there will be as many as a dozen vehicles, boats, trailers, jet skies etc. and 20-30 people at this property. The noise, litter, beach fires (during burn bans) and illegal fireworks is unacceptable and sanitation provided is very inadequate.

I believe growth and development should be very slow and limited. I especially do not want to see bicycle trails, foot-paths, more commerce, etc., that will attract tourists and day-trippers. I do not want the quiet rural environment altered or the traffic increased. Guemes functions best as a serene community, geared to those families that have chosen this quiet place to raise their children or retire to. I would like to see Guemes Island remain as it is for as long as possible.

Specific comments

Q. # Case #

Island Attributes

- 1 © 463,464 current level of safety is fine
- 1 (e) 191 rural/individual
- 1(f) 42 What law enforcement
- 1 (f) 333 Poor question – we need “better” law enforcement [see 5 (d)]
- 1 (f) 360 On island on-call law enforcement/authority desirable.
- 1 (f) 507, 508 (0) Confusing, can't answer.
- 1 (f) 403 (very) Current level of law enforcement is NOT adequate
- 1 (f) 459 Do not desire a greater law enforcement level than currently exists.
- 1 (f) 360 (not at all) On island on-call law enforcement/authority desirable.
- 1 (f) 464 Law enforcement fine as it is.
- 1 (g) 464 Appears to have hidden agenda in this question.
- 1 (h) 404 not clear on what you mean by “investment opportunity”.
- 1 (h) 462 I'm not sure what you mean about “investment opportunity” – investing in community or?
- 1,2,3 35, 36 List ALL the reasons we retired here.
- 1 135 I appreciate the store added in recent years
- 1 135 The Community Church is an important part of Island life
- 2 © 126 high bushes, weeds, trees hide deer inclined to leap out on roadway when cars pass.
- 2 (d) 173 Encourage the construction/expansion of more water retention ponds on island
- 2 (e) 191 State property
- 2 (g) 175 Too many deer + coyotes
- 2 (g) 415 (Somewhat) Need to implement better control for coyotes, deer and raccoons
- 2 (i) 112 Shorelines only open to property owners.
- 2 (i) 236 All public beach access should be marked and cleared. At least 2 N. Beach access sites are so overgrown that access is impossible.
- 2,3 424 #s 2 and 3: I feel that “junk” collectors should be more strictly dealt with to retain the rural beauty of Guemes
- 3 (a) 191 County code?
- 3 (b) 56 Many questions written very poorly – for example 3(b); if you want more, the same, or fewer commercial enterprises, how are you supposed to answer?
- 3 (b) 257 No more commercial enterprises! They should stay in Anacortes.
- 3 (b) 299 No more commercial/business zoning for development
- 3 (b) 387 I mean I don't want more “Commercial Development”
- 3 (b) 459 (very) No further commercial enterprises except cottage industries (i.e., art studios)
- 3 (b) 464 scale of commercial enterprises is perfect the way it is. Cottage industry or art studios would be fine. But no additional commercial buildings (the store + the resort are okay)
- 3 (b) 493 (very important) This question is confusing. It is very important that Guemes Island maintains its rural character; i.e., commercial ventures should be appropriate; i.e., no commercial retail development but a small restaurant, agricultural-based industry + cottage industry.
- 3 (g) 154 We watch the refinery belch out pollution at night and worry what we are all ingesting.

- 3 (g) 191 Refineries?
- 3 (g) 378 It is important, but refinery pollutes
- 3 (h) 459 (very) No public water systems.
- 3 (h) 464 No public water system
- 3 (i) 459 (very) No territorial lighting or street lighting except at ferry landing
- 3 77 Items circled VERY VERY IMPORTANT ASPECTS
- 3 112 keep this private island rustic
- 3 257 I would also include "No more noise pollution"
- 3 331 Why are these questions being asked? Is this committee going to do more than Skagit County requirements?
- 3 457,458 Water quality /seawater intrusion important to me and we need to work on area-wide solution – and soon.

Growth and Development

- 4 35, 36 TYPE of development is the issue. "Gentrification" of island – rising property taxes, large suburban homes drive up prop. values, requiring more "suburban" services + rising taxes would drive us + others of moderate retirement means off Guemes (see # 6 and # 34)
- 4 327 The main problem that I experience with respect to recent development is neighbors whose land use is not conforming to residential zoning restrictions.
- 4 331 What are you going to do – limit development?
- 4 462 I don't really like the repercussions of development i.e.: urban sprawl syndrome, ridiculous ferry policies and procedures.
- 4 459 Less is best.
- 4 464 I was originally opposed to the commercial dev't at the ferry landing. However, the Andersons have done such a fine job on the store that I believe they've enhanced the living quality on Guemes. That being said, I seriously doubt that any other commercial development could live up to that standard. On a case by case basis, I might agree to more commercial development. But it would have to be in keeping within the rustic and rural character of the island.
- 5 112 Go online for info.
- 5 (b) 306 Roads widened for bike lane or pedestrians would be good
- 5 (d) 323 We need law enforcement on this island – most important issue of all !!!
- 5 (e) 41 Do not have data on need
- 5 (e) 191 Not enough people to fund
- 5 (f) 191 Up to property owner
- 5 (f) 387 Only for seniors already living on Guemes.
- 5 (f) 404 Private in-home care or large facility?
- 5 (f) 462 (undesirable) Good to be able to live and learn from elders but not in nursing homes. Small scale.
- 5 (f) 464 Okay only as cottage industry or shared housing. Not okay as a formal commercial apartment-style living.
- 5 (h) 467 (neutral) some
- 5 (h) 464 Allow existing lot owners to build. No more sub-divisions. Okay for owners of 5-10 acres to build suitable dwellings (one or two per parcel)
- 5 (h,i) 191 Already restricted as population increases, need can increase
- 5 (h,i) 275 Would depend on what and where
- 5 (j) 41 Anacortes library is excellent

- 5 (j) 191 Need county-wide system.
- 5 (j) 192 County should set up library system; join SNO-ISLE library system.
- 5 (j) 236 Paying taxes to support Library District is a must for responsible citizens.
- 5 (j) 415 Volunteer library plus Anacortes library is more than adequate.
- 5 77 Items circled VERY VERY undesirable
- 5 331 These are biased questions
- 5 459 Owner-occupied builders only. No subdivisions below current (or 10-acre rule of county)
- 6 51 Why were economic issues (property tax, ferry cost, water, etc.) not included?
- 6 (i) 467 need later ferry at least 8 pm Mo-Thu.
- 6 (k) 333 (Length of commute time to Anacortes) already too long
- 6 (l) 41 Noisy neighbors/quality of living
- 6 (l) 111 Too much noise
- 6(f,g,h,j,) 77 VERY VERY significant to me
- 6 (l) 182 Reduced access to beaches, trails, and roadside berry vines
- 6 (l) 357 We have a "over-full" ferry now – since the ferry does not expand then no growth should take place and we should not be taxed in "any way" for more services.
- 6 (l) 366 Too much commercial development.
- 6 (l) 464 I am opposed to greatly increased population on Guemes. We already have some people here that don't fit in well with the close-knit community character. These are people that drive too fast, don't seem neighborly or interested in community; build big, fancy houses that stick out like sore thumbs; and generally do not participate as community members. They are the modern affluent element who treat Guemes as a bedroom in suburbia. Guemes is not a suburb of Seattle.
- 6 (l) 470 Nothing would lead me to move away from Guemes Island.
- 6 (l) 487 The ferry should not be used as a growth management tool. I pay taxes to support the roads and the ferry should have a longer schedule during the week. If you want growth management, write stricter development laws and codes. I "do not" believe a longer (Mon-Thu) schedule will cause a negative impact on the island. At the least, what about a 1 year trial period?
- 6 (l) 459 Extended ferry hours would be undesirable and would destroy the unique character of Guemes (it would create a bedroom community to Bellingham, Everett, and Seattle).
- 6 187 We have owned property on Guemes since 1990 but only visit as much as we can. Hope to build when we can.
- 6 213 It would take a combination of reasons for me to want to move away from Guemes. I don't think one specific thing would make me move away. I really love living on Guemes Island.
- 6 250 Move because of high taxes
- 6 275 Also depends on how much development + what kind. I could see us moving away if development really deteriorated quality of life.
- 6 337 High taxes
- 6 396 There is, of course, a point at which a conglomeration of factors could make the island intolerable, but its hard to imagine.
- 6 448 Beach degradation; septic problems; no salt water intrusion policy or water protection; no designated recharge areas
- 7,8 101 In a future questionnaire or "Evening Star" it might be enlightening to ask prime reason why people moved to Guemes and/or why they purchased property.

- 7 201 I treasure the rural environment on Guemes but oppose GIPAC and any attempts to impose restrictions and regulations on property owners by those who would impose their views on others. Property owners do preserve land without regulation.
- 7 404 Who decides what the “developments rights” are?
- 7 433 One cannot expect to restrict or remove one’s right to develop their own land (according to applicable development rights at time of (purchase)
- 7 459 Let multi-unit developers do their deed elsewhere. There is lots of land available in the state but a very limited amount of island space.
- 7 462 What sort of development are we giving rights to? I think the most important thing is that we keep balance with natural cycles – anything out of balance shouldn’t be allowed.
- 7 463 This question needs more definition between development rights and preservation.
- 8 56 Too many questions are loaded so everyone will answer them the same way (such as question 8) This wastes time and doesn’t tell you anything you didn’t already know.
- 8 76 Concerned about lack of water and conservation of water.
- 8 148 Increase in growth rate will ultimately result in the need for paid, full-time fire protection, law enforcement, public water system, etc.) see item 6 for additional detail also.
- 8 159 I don’t consider data for growth 1990-2000 is correctly describing “current” growth rates. Suspect it is > 20% in 2000-2004.
- 8 201 2% annual growth rate is much less than the state and western Washington in particular and is not bad.
- 8 260 Question 8 seems to imply a growth rate of full time residents only. I believe “weekenders” and part-time growth should be considered when determining growth agendas. I believe your 2 % growth rate is understated, if you include the above-mentioned population. Therefore, the growth rate should be less.
- 9 168 Larger ferry boat but keep same schedule!!! It is clear that during peak-season boat cannot handle higher demands on island!!! Especially dangerous as cars are parking on road close to c.c. to wait for ferry. Waiting for an accident to happen.
- 9 (a) 366,367 (more) organic farming
- 9 (a) 404 (more) if it’s organic sustainable (farming).
- 9 (a) 462 (more) If it is organic and sustainable/not chemically dependent; we should be able to provide ourselves with all the fresh organic produce we need.
- 9 © 75 I would like to see an end to commercial crab fishing on the North Shore of G.I. and no “parking” of oil tankers in non-industrial areas,
- 9 © 191 ? meaning.
- 9 © 375 Define aquaculture – fishfarm? = “NO”
- 9 (d,e) 464 low impact business only, nothing industrial.
- 9 (e) 462 (more) Maybe 1 more.
- 9 (f) 18 Same but better quality boat launches
- 9 (f) 19 More and better boat launches
- 9 (f) 47 Boat launch most important
- 9 (f) 275 We really need a good public boat launch with parking year around + also a public dock.
- 9 (f) 276 public boat launch with trailer parking – year around.
- 9 (f) 330 More boat launch access. Boat launch on public access on West Beach on all road ends. There are several road ends that would make fabulous boat launches! County Comprehensive Plan states that beach access is priority (see #9 concerning “increasing access to natural resource lands and WATER).

- 9 (f) 447 Improved boat launch
- 9(f) 459 Better maintenance of current boat ramp. If possible, move to more sheltered area.
- 9 (f) 464 The existing boat launch at the ferry landing is dangerous because of strong current and difficult to maintain because of shoreline sand drift. I am opposed to any actions that would interfere with the natural movement of sand + tide because it always results in degradation of the remaining beach. The only other boat launches that I am aware of are private (the resort) and the road into it is steep and difficult to manage with anything but a small boat (under 18'). I would like to see a public access boat launch (not North Beach) on another area of island. The difficulty is that a boat launch requires a large parking lot to be available to handle the vehicle+ trailer parked all day or overnight and I think that would be undesirable and an eyesore. I don't know of any way to reconcile these opposing forces, but it might be possible.
- 9(f,h) 35, 36 Hopefully would encourage less ferry use, along with ferry rates and #22+5(c)
- 9 (f) 473 (more) Not more boat launches but improving the N & S, w/adequate (well-marked) trailer parking.
- 9 (g) 61 Wind o.k. less of cell + utility
- 9 (g) 141 Wind towers okay
- 9 (g) 177 Cell towers, Utility towers "No!" These should be listed separate . Wind Turbine Towers borrow the breezes; Utility towers pollute our views.
- 9 (g) 248 More wind towers, less utility cell towers
- 9 (g) 249 Bad question –wind towers are good; utility and cell towers undesirable
- 9 (g) 251 "more", excepting cell towers – we do not need more microwave pollution.
- 9 (g) 252 less cell, more wind
- 9 (g) 277 more wind towers less cell + utility towers
- 9 (g) 306 Wind generators would be o.k. – not more commercial towers.
- 9 (g) 320 More wind, tidal, solar – self-sustaining energy.
- 9 (g) 327 More wind towers, no cell towers
- 9 (g) 341 # 9 (g) is a biased question.
- 9 (g) 374 Wind towers – more. They're just fine; less cell towers.
- 9 (g) 375 Wind towers are o.k.
- 9 (g) 396 Wind only.
- 9 (g) 411 (Same) I would support more wind towers, but not necessarily more utility or cell towers
- 9 (g) 433 There must be some restriction on wind towers, same as cell towers
- 9 (g) 447 Improved wind and solar.
- 9 (g) 448 (more) wind and solar only.
- 9 (g) 451 Wind towers o.k.
- 9 (g) 459 More wind towers okay.
- 9 (g) 464 More wind towers okay for private use.
- 9 (h) 151 Amount of (ferry) parking not an issue, but amount of junk cars is.
- 9 (h) 152 Assuming proposed ferry parking not included.
- 9 (h) 473 Need to encourage walk-ons; need more parking=current ferry lasts longer w/population.
- 9 (h) 462 (same) Not impervious surfaces
- 9 (i,j,k) 192 Can consider increase as population increases
- 9 (k) 336 Less bicycle + other off-island tourists
- 9(l) 94 More dance-kid-friendly at Hall. Plus more readings, art shows, art lessons, and more exercise classes!

- 9 (l) 404 Don't know of any now.
- 9 (m) 404 What senior day care is available now?
- 9 (l,m) 101 Can't rate
- 9 (n) 130 preservation/restoration of native areas
- 9 (n) 162 less political signs posted in yards, an ordinance to restrict size and length of posting.
- 9 (n) 174 Protected moorage here plus a dock for small craft on the Anacortes side.
- 9 (n) 306 More community gatherings/potlucks
- 9 (n) 320 More of all organic farming and agriculture
- 9 (n) 337 Daytime adult classes
- 9 (n) 361 A useful, part-time cottage industry would be reasonably priced regular hair cutting/salon services on island. The older women (in fact, most women) like to look nice anytime and can have problems getting to town. At this time, \$15.00 is the usual price at the retirement + residences in town. A thought, perhaps, but one to be considered seriously.
- CAVEAT> things accomplished from need as desire that enhance your own spaces, often in spite of resource limitations: are inadvertently inevitably inviting and attractive. I.e., sweet little library, the equipped parks, the beach walks. Be careful what is asked for the prices can be high in many ways. But when do we pay attention? This is the time.
- 9(n) 363 Hardware store
- 9 (n) 410 (Same) Existing launch ramp should be improved to facilitate recreational boating and alternate vehicle removal in ferry emergencies.
- 9 (n) 447 more monitoring of fresh water use
- 9 (n) 467 (more) Pharmacy – urgent care- pub or diner.
- 9 (n) 477 Public load/unload float maintained by county and better designed, built, and maintained launch ramp.
- 9 (n) 493 (more) Winery (vineyards), brewery, art gallery + art shows, alternative energy, “green” friendly ventures
- 9 159 Would like to see more progressive infrastructure – underground power lines, high-speed cable available everywhere.
- 9 213 I think things should stay the same on Guemes for the most part. I'm not sure if we need more youth programs or senior daycare. I don't have kids and I am not a senior. I would like a bed & breakfast to choose from so relatives of islanders have more options besides the resort which, I think, is over-priced.
- 9 275 I would support a marina/restaurant/small inn
- 9 290 People trying to run my goddamn life!!
- 9 331 Less intervention fro Guemes Island Committees; I would like to see more access to the shoreline, develop all road ends to the shoreline. I would rather have Guemes do what the county allows + encourage people to live up to the growth management standards rather than dictate what people do on their own property.
- 9 447 More monitoring of fresh water use.
- 9 448 More rain water collection and more monitoring of clam + crab harvest.
- 10 (a) 320 Less lawns, more native vegetation
- 10 (a,b,f,g) 191 NO, NO, NO, NO
- 10 (d,f,g) 433 Already done by county
- 10 (f) 403 Instead, limit the # of dwellings to be built on a min of 5 to 10 acre parcel of land w/no expansion of “lots” permitted for building.
- 10 (f) 404 1 huge Walmart on 10 acres –NO-; 3 bungalows /cottages on 10 acres-YES-

- 10 (f) 462 (yes) Depends on situation.
- 10 (g) 457,458 I am concerned that increased restrictions and setback requirements may make some of the existing small lots unusable- thus resulting in a “taking of property”.
- 10 (g) 462 Well, yes along shoreline, but who defines sensitive areas?
- 10 159 Limit residence size to 3500 or 4000 ft.
- 10 201 Property owners should be allowed to improve/remodel their property without interference.
- 10 337 Don’t know present construction restrictions.
- 10 374 Variance procedures should be followed.
- 10 447 Proof that construction will not degrade environment or neighbor’s resources, such as water.
- 10 459 No public projects or multi-family housing. No development of spec. homes (owner occupied only)
- 10 467 Except to improve views.
- 11 26 Question is unanswerable because there is no statement about what is being stored outdoors. Did you intend cars and/or boats or refrigerators, lumber piles, sewer pipes? Please say so or give us samples of your intend.
- 11 151 What does this mean?
- 11 162 The storage of what??
- 11 233 Not clear what you are talking about
- 11 266 Do not understand.
- 11 290 People trying to run my goddamn life!!
- 11 306 Don’t understand what this refers to.
- 11 374 More clarification is needed.
- 11 404 Again, who decides?
- 11 408 What is current status of outdoor storage? What type of safety hazards?
- 11 459 Who determines? Messy yards? Trash? Extra vehicles? As long as owner works toward compliance with county rules, form no harsh timelines or threats offines and liens. (Badly worded question)
- 11 462 Unclear question.
- 11 464 Lack of information; no definition or examples of health or safety hazard are given. Hidden agenda?
- 13 101 don’t encourage controversy or another “layer”
- 13 204 Keep the County Gov’t away from Guemes. They encourage growth because it brings in more taxes. We do not need more growth nor do we need to pay more taxes. And we don’t need another \$360,000 study. – Just leave us alone.
- 13 403 Who pays the taxes? Just Guemes Islanders?
- 13 404 Again, who decides?
- 13 459 Not as long as Skagit County rules Guemes. Need to form island incorporated identity. For now only boat launch or other public use approved by ballot, with sunset clause. Boat launch users who live on Guemes should drive their rigs back home and park at home, then come back with car only. That means you need a dock. Suggest sharing with private launch facility but no formal marina.
- 13 464 Not unless Guemes is incorporated as an island. No new services from Skagit County Gov’t.

- 14 35, 36 Certainly a land/housing tract developer should not pass infrastructure costs on to existing taxpayers.
- 14 112 New and current full time residents should bear all costs
- 14 167 Poorly worded question – how about a “no expansion” alternative?
- 14 192 Island-wide H2O system is a political tool used – No Need; new roads to new areas – a new owner responsibility otherwise tax all.
- 14 257 Developers should bear most of the cost
- 14 384 A water line should be run from Anacortes to be shared by all islanders & a PUD should be formed to pay for it.
- 14 394 Water charges should be based on usage, which is the nationwide custom. For example, all current residents are using H2O from an aquifer that is not confined beneath the property they own. They are using water from beyond their own property boundaries. The point is, that infrastructure needs are created by existing and new residents. It is unclear in this survey how you are using population growth. Many people reside here less than 10% of the time, obviously, the impact on the environment is greatest by year-round residents. Watering of yards, gardens, car-washing etc. should be prohibited.
- 14 404 Tourists should pay – we wouldn’t need “updating” except for them
- 14 459 If any expansion is permitted at all. No large-scale projects (except boat ramp okay)
- 14 462 Limit growth -> no more parking lots, no more impervious surfaces, especially near shorelines.
- 14 464 I am not in favor of new infra-structure or services.
- 14 473 Both should share cost but newer people pay proportionally more.
- 15 76 Stop growth until conservation and resource availability issues are resolved.
GOOD QUESTIONS!
- 15 77 YES! YES! YES! YES!
- 15 459 No new sub-divisions permitted – period!
- 15 464 I am absolutely opposed to new sub-divisions
- 15 467 (A,B) why a moratorium – why not an agreed-upon limit.

County Rules for Development

- 16 141 I love the store as it is
- 16 201 Any future commercial activity should be concentrated at the hub of current activity which is the ferry dock.
- 16 306 It might depend on what the commercial venture was.
- 16 408 How big is the existing current commercial zoning near the ferry dock?
- 16 459 We need to leave the county and not permit county rules that would support development.
- 16-20 464 I would like to see Guemes Island become independent of Skagit County, where we contract for whatever services we need. Stop being a cash con for county gov’t!! Forbid all profit-motivated development (e.g., no spec. housing or housing developments and stop division beyond what’s currently been allowed)
- 16 467 (A,B) within limits
- 17 133 Support 5-acre developments only. No more building!

- 17 111 As long as it is not a requirement
- 17 213 I lean towards clustering houses on smaller lots with open spaces but it's hard to "favor" neighborhoods on Guemes.
- 17 248 Clustering okay but no "bonus" dwellings
- 17 249 As long as it doesn't result in an increase in # of allowed dwellings.
- 17 459 Change current law – no smaller lots than permitted now. Publicize this so no one buys land with the idea of subdividing so they can live off the proceeds in their retirement. Leaving large tracts of land undeveloped is currently being practiced. Island vote should be required for large-scale changes.
- 18 167 Instead of "conservation easement" you should say "permanently protected" – keep the language consistent.
- 18 191 Unrealistic – must allow for expansion
- 18 192 Should not be one way – evaluate individually.
- 18 333 Don't favor clustering period.
- 18 337 Unclear if land is owned privately or is it state land your talking about?
- 18 339 If we get rid of natural woods - etc. environment- it would possibly be the end of a beautiful place!
- 18 387 "Permanently protected"
- 18 459 Conservation easement on private volunteer basis (and educate property owners)
- 18 462 It shouldn't be "one or the other"; the issue is more complex than that..
- 18 467 (A,B) combination, depending upon amount of space.
- 19 19 Confusing question: do you mean to buy them away so the land can not be developed, or so it can be developed?
- 19 201 Property taxes to purchase development rights is a double whammy: raising property taxes directly and by restricting available land/raising demand.
- 19 459 Limit taxable value of property to original purchase price. Let Nature Conservancy or similar groups pay for property. No public spending.
- 19 464 Except by non-profit organizations such as Audubon Society, Sierra Club, or Nature Conservancy.
- 19 499 (strongly support) Did number 19 mean tax dollars for preservation? Not development? I will guess to preservation.
- 19,20 80 Unclear- is this to purchase development rights so that others can't use them, then yes, is this for developers, then no.
- 19,20 310 With reference to 19+20 I don't really understand what "purchasing property rights" means?
- 20 112 question twenty makes no sense?
- 20 341 # 20 is a biased question. Why?

Transportation

- 21 (b) 111 or 30 mph – ideally 25 mph on some roads like South Shore Drive + Rd + up at N. Beach.
- 21(b) 24 There is no law on or off the island of any kind even speed limit signs are poorly placed (25mph)
- 21 (b) 323 Traffic should be slower and enforced.
- 21(b) 35, 26 would be unenforceable

- 21 (b) 387 This limit would be ok if it was enforced – lower limit won't change anything unless it's enforced.
- 21 (b) 454 Max. speed limit 30.
- 21 (f) 239 This will take care of #22:
- 21 47 South Shore Rd is falling away east of ferry dock – a guard rail could possibly save someone.
- 21 132 Better speed control on roads, especially in built-up areas. Since the county can't post a deputy, perhaps loan radar cart to a responsible resident. Also, allow residents to place cones in road center to slow traffic.
- 21 133 I support speed bumps! Traffic on N. Beach needs to be slowed!
- 21 141 Add speed bumps (3) between tideflats at North Beach + Gravel Pit
- 21 191 Some "roads" are only easements
- 21 192 Roads are not dangerous. Drivers are!! Bikers follow rules of the road – need responsible drivers.
- 21 223 Speeding is out of control – need some sort of enforcing even if it is "un-announced" and part time. I suspect the revenue at first would be more than cover the cost.
- 21 249 A provision for parking at community center + park events is needed
- 21 265 enforce the speed limits on Guemes Island. We don't believe a speeding ticket has ever been given here. We live in a 25 mph zone where people consistently drive over 40 mph. We understand the Sheriff Dept. is understaffed and no doubt under-funded. The Dept. does a good job with the man power it has but something more has to be done for law enforcement for the island.
- 21 372 Make sure all road surfaces are in good order! I am not sure GIPAC has the full support or respect of the majority of Guemes Islanders. Before any policy is dictated or recommended, this issue should be resolved.
- 22 (f) 473 Would like to see horse-friendly trail if this occurs.
- 22 47 The roads on G.I. are dangerous to pedestrians and bicycle-riders. People drive too fast!
- 22 177 Maybe clever polite "Bike Ped" signal warnings giving right-of-way cautions.
- 22 192 Bike-walking path in some areas.
- 22 459 Bicycles should face oncoming traffic just like pedestrians. That would improve safety.
- 22 462 Bike and pedestrians should have right-of-way & do not require more paved surfaces – precisely the reason many people choose car-free transportation.
- 22 510 Add shoulders where needed for parking or enforce fence setbacks
- 23 172 You have already wasted enough money trying to fix something that isn't broken. Why did you waste the money to print on both sides of this paper? As most survey's, I don't think you or anybody on the committee really gives a damn what is the outcome as long as the paycheck doesn't bounce!!!
- 23 447 (no) Should be funded by county whose work the committee is doing.
- 23 459 (yes) I think we should carry out planning as funding is available. I would not favor tax dollars being spent, beyond what is currently allowed.
- 23 464 (yes) All contributions private and voluntary. If there are "angels" who'd be willing to contribute necessary funds for the GIPAC effort, they should be repaid through ongoing community fund-raising, even if it takes years (for re-payment). (like the handicap bathrooms at Community Center)

Demographics

- 24-29 384 #s24-29 are divisive
- 24 35, 36 We consider regular contributions to + service on community organizations a legitimate "rent" to pay for living on Guemes Island
- 24 61 Not at this time, was more involved in the past + will be again in future
- 24 409 I am involved in helping the community through other means than organizations.
- 24 459 I* helped build the Murray Read Pavilion even though I'm mostly a weekend resident.
-
- 25 112 own 2 lots
- 25 152 daughter of resident/ part time resident
- 25 374 ½ time resident – own home
- 25 421 I own undeveloped land and rent a house on Edens Rd
-
- 28 35, 36 Coming here part-time 20 yrs, full-time 6 yrs
- 28 112 landowner since 1965 – camping lots
- 28 151 Does this mean full time resident or property owner? I chose the latter.
- 28 193 I have owned the 48 years, part-time resident 14 years
- 28 374 Home owner 5-10 yrs – not resident?
- 28 421 I am a part-time resident, working toward full-time.
- 28 456 I have spent summers on Guemes for 47 years.
-
- 29-34 468 Not important to survey!
- 30 459 I have two 4-year degrees (history + fisheries biologist) and one 2-year degree (accounting)
- 32-34 469 Have nothing to do with this survey: in other words (none of your business)
- 32-34 384 #s32-34 has no merit
- 32 499 I am part-time employed ½ off-island and part-time self-employed ½ (on island).
- 30,34 292 #s 30 and 34 do not apply to sub area planning.
- 30,34 293 #s 30 and 34 do not in any way relate to sub area planning.
-
- 33 409 Approximately half my income is earned on Guemes
- 33 421 Hoping to increase this to "C" w/installation of cable modem soon.
- 34 35, 36 This is the reality factor regarding staying here (#6)
- 34 145 Gross Income has nothing to do with Island planning
- 34 146 No comment
- 34 147 Is my own business – no answer
- 34 162 Not relevant
- 34 180 What does household income have to do with growth
- 34 265 Our income is none of your business

Comments by Al and Diana Millikan

These comments are in response to the Guemes Island Planning Survey of July 20, 2004. We were originally attracted to Guemes Island by the rural environment and the casual atmosphere. This includes a live and let live attitude and respecting other residents choices and rights. It also includes a zoning regime which protects the rural nature of the island without impeding property owners rights. Fourteen years later we still savor the overall ambiance of island life. **We oppose** any additional constraints or regulations which would limit the freedom and property rights of land owners, and will cause intense and bitter controversy.

Guemes Island does not need a more restrictive sub area plan. Future growth on the island. is already limited by the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan as well as existing zoning regulations, ferry service, water and sewer constraints and land already protected by conservation easements. The island is rural and relatively undeveloped. For example, The lots on the north side of South Shore Drive are well over 5 acres with no more than one home per lot. At least eight parcels adjacent to our home are over 9 acres and cannot be subdivided and one 20 acre plot has a conservation easement. In addition the large "Demopolis" waterfront tract is protected from development . These types of open space are common on the island.

The survey seems to be drafted in a way to achieve a intended outcome and smacks of the "not is my back yard" syndrome. Suggestions such as "restrict clearing of trees while building," and "encourage siting buildings at the edge of a parcel" etc., makes our hair stand on end!! Further, questions 28-34 are personal and unnecessary and should not be included in the survey without a **precise** explanation of how and why they will be used. If many individuals, like ourselves, refuse to answer these questions, the survey will likely produce inaccurate results.

We are also very concerned that an unscientific poll such as this can result in subjective conclusions which favor the preconceived outcome. Also, putting two survey answer forms on one page encourages one person to complete the survey twice, and, allowing resident non land owners to participate may skew the results because the outcome does not come at a cost to their property value, property rights and personal freedom.

Guemes Island is a wonderful place to live. Lets not spoil it by imposing unnecessary new regulations and impositions on landowners.

Guemes Island Planning Survey

Extended Analysis

Rate of return is 46 %

Number of respondents N = 515

Comparison with frequency analysis of entire population with N = 511

1. The island population was divided into 4 groups:

- a) residents, residing less than 50% of time on the island (n=70)
- b) residents, residing more than 50% of time on the island (n=268)
- c) non-resident, undeveloped property (n=56)
- d) non-resident, developed property (n=109)

We compared the responses of these groups to survey questions 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, and 23.

13. Should Guemes Island form a tax-payer-funded Park District for purchase of land for parks, trails, boat launch or other public use?

	total population	a	b	c	d
Missing cases	1	0	1	0	0
A. Yes	29.4 %	27.1	26.6	32.1	37.6
B. No	44.5	52.9	45.7	35.7	37.6
C. Unsure	22.2	18.6	24.7	19.6	20.2
D. No opinion	3.9	1.4	3.0	12.5	4.6

14. When growth and development come to a community, new infrastructure and services are needed (for example, more ferry parking, better roads, fire, police, island-wide public water system) In your opinion, who should pay for the expansion of services required by new development?

	total population	a	b	c	d
Missing cases	8	1	7	0	0
A. Current residents	2.4 %	2.9	1.9	5.4	1.8
B. New owners	41.6	39.1	49.4	26.8	33.9
C. Both	45.5	44.9	38.3	53.6	56.9
D. Unsure	8.4	11.6	9.2	7.1	4.6
E. No opinion	2.2	1.4	1.1	7.1	2.8

15. Understanding that this process may take several years, would you like to see a moratorium on the issuing of new land subdivision permits on Guemes Island while the Sub-Area Plan is being developed?

	total population	a	b	c	d
Missing cases	6	1	4	0	1
A. Yes	67.7 %	65.2	70.8	57.1	69.4
B. No	20.6	18.8	19.3	28.6	17.6
C. Unsure	9.3	11.6	9.1	7.1	10.2
D. No opinion	2.4	4.3	0.8	7.1	2.8

19. Would you support spending property tax dollars to purchase development rights? (Mark one)

	total population	a	b	c	d
Missing cases	13	2	9	2	0
A. Strongly support	15.9 %	17.6	14.7	27.8	11.0
B. Support	23.3	14.7	27.4	9.3	27.5
C. Do not support	39.2	41.2	43.6	24.1	33.0
D. Unsure	21.7	26.5	14.3	38.9	28.4

if you answered C. or D., please skip the next question

20. In order to preserve land as stated in question 20, how much of a property tax increase would you be willing to support?

	total population	a	b	c	d
Missing cases	263	41	136	28	52
A property rate increase of:					
A. \$5.00	31.0 %	27.6	34.1	32.1	26.3
B. \$10.00	35.5	20.7	35.6	39.3	40.3
C. \$25.00	22.6	27.6	23.5	14.3	24.6
D. > \$25.00	10.9	24.1	6.8	14.3	8.8

per \$100,000 of assessed valuation

Professional consulting services are needed in order to prepare a Sub-Area Plan that is consistent with the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan. Skagit County is at this time not in a position to provide a consultant's fees. Some funds have been granted, but not sufficient to complete the project.

23. Would you support fund-raising through on-island donations to continue the Guemes Island Planning Advisory Committee's planning effort?

	total population	a	b	c	d
Missing cases	6	1	2	0	1
A. Yes	58.6 %	60.9	60.5	48.2	60.2
B. No	18.0	13.0	20.7	14.3	14.8
C. Unsure	17.8	23.2	14.3	26.8	18.5
D. No opinion	5.5	2.9	4.5	10.7	6.5

2. The island population was divided into 2 groups:

- a) property owners, owning less than 20 acres (n=461)
- b) property owners, owning 20 acres or more (n= 44)

We compared the responses of these groups to survey questions 17, 18, and 19 (clustering and development right purchases)

17. Current law permits land to be developed so that residences are clustered on smaller lots, leaving large amounts of property undeveloped. Do you favor or oppose this clustering approach?

	total population	a	b
Missing cases	4	3	1
A. Favor	49.1 %	46.7	72.1
B. Oppose	22.9	23.6	18.6
C. Unsure	22.7	24.0	7.0
D. No opinion	5.3	5.7	2.3

18. In the case of clustered development, should the large open space area be set aside for future development or should it be permanently protected?

	total population	a	b
Missing cases	11	8	1
A. Future Development	6.0 %	5.1	16.3
B. Conservation Easement	77.6	78.4	72.1
C. Unsure	12.8	12.6	11.6
D. No opinion	3.6	4.0	0.0

19. Would you support spending property tax dollars to purchase development rights?

	total population	a	b
Missing cases	13	12	1
A. Strongly support	15.9 %	16.3	9.3
B. Support	23.3	22.5	37.2
C. Do not support	39.2	39.2	37.2
D. Unsure	21.7	22.0	16.3

3. Community Issues were compared to demographics:

We selected people who voted high on survey question 1:

- a) Strong community involvement (n=209)
- c) Sense of safety (n=374)
- e) Sense of belonging (n=222)

24. How involved are you in community activities or organizations (e.g. Community Center, Fire Hall, GIPOA, CERT, Women's Club, etc.)?

	total population	a	c	e
Missing cases	8	1	4	2
A. Very	10.5 %	20.7	10.3	17.7
B. Somewhat	39.2	46.2	41.9	51.4
C. Not at all	50.3	33.2	47.8	30.9

25. I am:

	total population	a	c	e
Missing cases	9	3	5	3
A. Resident, own home	63.5 %	70.9	64.0	71.7
B. Resident, not own home	4.4	6.3	5.4	6.8
C. Non-res., owner undev. prop.	10.8	8.3	10.0	6.8
D. Non-res. owner dev. prop.	21.3	14.6	20.6	14.6

26. What percentage of the time do you reside on Guemes Island annually?

	total population	a	c	e
Missing cases	13	4	10	3
A. 0-25%	31.7 %	20.0	31.0	19.2
B. 26%-50%	14.1	15.1	12.9	15.1
C. 51%-75%	7.6	7.3	6.6	5.5
D. 76%-100%	46.6	57.6	49.5	60.3

27. How much land do you own on Guemes Island?

	total population	a	c	e
Missing cases	10	4	5	4
A. None	3.4 %	5.4	4.3	5.5
B. Less than 1 acre	33.3	27.3	35.2	29.8
C. 1 to less than 6 acres	38.9	38.5	37.9	39.0
D. 6 to less than 20 acres	15.6	20.5	15.4	17.0
E. 20 acres or more	8.8	8.3	7.0	8.7

28. How many years have you been a resident of Guemes Island?

Missing cases	13	2	8	5
A. None	12.2 %	9.2	11.5	8.8
B. Up to 5 years	16.9	23.2	18.3	24.9
C. 5 to 10 years	16.9	17.9	16.9	17.1
D. 10 to 20 years	24.7	28.5	26.2	27.7
E. More than 20 years	29.3	21.3	27.0	21.7

29. What is your age group?

Missing cases	18	2	8	3
A. 20 or under	0.6 %	1.4	0.5	0.0
B. 21 to 34	3.0	6.8	3.8	5.9
C. 35 to 49	15.2	15.9	15.0	11.9
D. 50 to 64	45.8	46.9	44.0	47.9
E. 65 or older	35.3	29.0	36.6	34.2

30. What is your highest level of education?

Missing cases	31	7	20	7
A. High school or less	5.8 %	5.0	5.1	4.2
B. Some college or techn. school	15.4	12.9	16.1	15.8
C. 2 year degree	5.6	5.4	6.5	4.7
D. 4 year degree	34.6	36.6	35.6	37.2
E. Advanced degree	38.5	40.1	36.7	38.1

32. What is your employment status?

Missing cases	23	6	13	6
A. Self-employed	21.7 %	22.2	22.4	24.5
B. Full-time employee	22.1	22.7	20.8	20.5
C. Part-time employee	7.6	7.4	7.8	6.9
D. Retired	45.9	44.3	46.5	44.4
E. Other	2.7	3.4	2.5	3.7

33. What portion of your income is from work performed on Guemes Island?

Missing cases	30	8	18	7
A. None	84.0 %	79.1	83.1	80.9
B. Less than half	8.7	10.0	8.4	8.4
C. More than half, but not all	4.4	7.5	4.8	6.0
D. All	2.9	3.5	3.7	4.7

34. What is your household gross annual income?

	total population	a	c	e
Missing cases	94	32	64	41
A. less than \$17,500	5.5 %	8.5	6.1	7.7
B. \$17,501 - \$32,000	9.8	7.3	9.7	8.8
C. \$32,001 - \$43,000	11.3	10.7	10.0	12.2
D. \$43,001 - \$75,000	29.7	32.2	30.3	30.9
E. \$75,001 - \$120,00	25.2	24.3	26.5	24.9
F. in excess of \$120,000	18.5	16.9	17.4	15.5

4. Demographics of people strong on property rights

We selected the people who answered survey question 7 with numbers 1 through 5, and looked at demographics questions 25 – 29 (n = 131)

25. I am:	total population	strong prop. rights
Missing cases	9	4
A. Resident, own home	63.5 %	61.4
B. Resident, not own home	4.4	0.8
C. Non-res., owner undev. prop.	10.8	11.8
D. Non-res. owner dev. prop.	21.3	26.0

26. What percentage of the time do you reside on Guemes Island annually?

Missing cases	13	5
A. 0-25%	31.7 %	40.5
B. 26%-50%	14.1	12.7
C. 51%-75%	7.6	7.1
D. 76%-100%	46.6	39.7

27. How much land do you own on Guemes Island?

Missing cases	10	4
A. None	3.4 %	0.8
B. Less than 1 acre	33.3	28.3
C. 1 to less than 6 acres	38.9	40.9
D. 6 to less than 20 acres	15.6	19.7
E. 20 acres or more	8.8	10.2

28. How many years have you been a resident of Guemes Island?

Missing cases	13	5
A. None	12.2 %	14.3
B. Up to 5 years	16.9	7.9
C. 5 to 10 years	16.9	11.1
D. 10 to 20 years	24.7	27.0
E. More than 20 years	29.3	39.7

29. What is your age group?

Missing cases	18	9
A. 20 or under	0.6 %	0.8
B. 21 to 34	3.0	1.6
C. 35 to 49	15.2	15.6
D. 50 to 64	45.8	44.3
E. 65 or older	35.3	37.7

5. Years on the island versus moratorium. (survey question 15).

We selected two groups:

- a) less than 10 years on the island (n = 232)
- b) 10 years or more on the island (n = 270)

	total population	a	b
Missing cases	6	3	3
A. Yes	67.7 %	69.4	66.7
B. No	20.6	17.0	23.6
C. Unsure	9.3	10.5	7.9
D. No opinion	2.4	3.1	1.9

6. Acreage owned on the island versus moratorium.

We selected two groups:

- a) own less than 20 acres (n = 461)
- b) own 20 acres or more (n = 44)

	total population	a	b
Missing cases	6	4	1
A. Yes	67.7 %	68.9	51.2
B. No	20.6	18.6	44.2
C. Unsure	9.3	10.1	2.3
D. No opinion	2.4	2.4	2.3

7. Moratorium and property rights (survey question 7)

We selected two groups:

- a) pro moratorium (n = 343)
- b) against moratorium (n = 107)

	total population	a	b
Missing cases	6	4	1

development rights

most important

1	3.2	0.9	12.3
2	1.8	0.0	8.5
3	4.4	0.6	14.2
4	3.0	1.5	9.4
5	13.5	8.0	21.7
6	6.3	5.6	5.7
7	11.3	10.9	12.3
8	17.0	20.4	4.7
9	11.5	14.2	3.8
10	28.1	38.1	7.5

preservation rights

most important

Analyzed by Rebecca Paskind
 Compiled by Marianne Kooiman
 April, 2005

