

The Comp Plan/LDC Working Group is supportive of the efforts of staff and the PAB on Vision Plan 2045. In this document, we are offering additional input related to the goals and objectives of Themes 4-5. Our previous responses to the Vision Plan 2045 draft are attached.

As with the other three themes, we need to realize that recognizing, planning for and adapting to the dynamics of future change resulting from sea level rise and climate change will be essential for the effectiveness of planning for Future-Ready Infrastructure, Utilities & Public Facilities as well as Mobility & Accessibility.

Theme 4: Future-Ready Infrastructure, Utilities & Public Facilities

The Comp Plan/LDC Working Group supports the goals identified in Theme 4. For additional explanation, please refer to our comments related to this goal in our first general response to the Vision Plan (see attachment). Here, we would like to emphasize the following:

- A **resilient Smart Grid** is essential to our future. It must be **effective** and **available to all at a moderate cost** in order to support our communication, education, economy, resiliency and social stability. This could be a public-private effort, but it will, at a minimum, be essential for the City to leverage its influence effectively to achieve this goal.
- All infrastructure, utilities and public facilities must be future-ready.
- The expenditures needed to support routine maintenance, replacement, renovation and rebuilding of public facilities, utilities and infrastructure, including walkovers, must be addressed through serious **long-term fiscal planning** to avoid the type of situation we currently face. Ideally this should cover 40 or 45 years. Our current Comp Plan requires 20 years.

Theme 5: Mobility & Accessibility

The Comp Plan/LDC Working Group supports the goals identified in Theme 5. Refer also to our first general response to the Vision Plan (attached). The comments below are directed towards goals not included in Theme 5 and goals that we feel need to be stressed due to importance.

- As indicated previously, we would like to see our **bike and pedestrian safety** live up to its rating.
- As noted in the Vision Plan draft, **mobility, traffic, and parking** are the second most commonly noted issues in public input. None of these are challenges that the City can manage effectively in isolation. Our heavily traveled roads are connected to fast growing surrounding areas that compound the problem. Therefore, **this is a County and regional problem that requires collaboration and coordination.**
- Isolated studies and planning for transportation and parking are important, but a **broad, holistic approach** needs to be taken, including all types of transportation and parking for the entire island and hopefully the entire county, in order to develop a plan that will

work well for the community for the long term. It is critical that the City be involved in all such planning in the County from the early stages. We need considerable **creative thinking in developing effective mobility solutions**, and we need the engagement and strategies that can be provided by all of our major employers. At this point, however, **we need a clear holistic plan for study and analysis.**

- Given that we are subject to weather events and potential disasters from the port, plants, airport and train systems, it is critical that we have an integrated **hazard evacuation and mitigation plan.** This is as relevant to Theme 4 as it is to Theme 5. This plan requires analysis of responses to prior events, current mapping systems and analysis of the island's carrying capacity. It also requires that elements from the other themes be integrated, such as vulnerable floodplain and marshes, historic resources, schools, vulnerable age groups and neighborhoods. It is critical that our local elected officials, city and county staff and community leaders implement a coordinated plan that includes notification, evacuation and mitigation of damage.
- **Complete Streets** has been adopted by a number of communities nationally to address mobility issues. However, we have seen **no evidence that it is appropriate for a small barrier island where incompatible development patterns have been established for decades or even centuries.** As with the increase in bike paths, Complete Streets is an example of a set of goals that must be interwoven with and moderated by other themes. For example, implementing some of the approaches would negatively impact density concerns and potentially damage businesses and the environment. **We would prefer that a plan be developed specifically for this island or this county. If Complete Streets is adopted, it will be of utmost importance that the values, character and form of the City be built into the plan.**

Those of us on the Comp Plan/LDC Working Group greatly appreciate the opportunity to provide input on the Vision Plan. Please feel free to contact us if there is need for clarification or discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendelle Burdick, Patricia Bux, Richard Doster, Beth Foster, Lauree Hemke, Terry Grady, Frank Hopf, Betsie Huben, Carlton Jones, Cynthia Jones-Jackson, Margaret Kirkland, Tammi Kosack, Alexandra Lajoux, Roger Nordlinger, Robert Prager, Faith Ross, Ron Sapp, Elise Pearlstine, Leonard Pearlstine, Richard Polk and Joyce Tuten

Comp Plan/LDC Working Group
aiwg.org