

**Skagit Regional Airport Consultation Meeting
June 18, 2014**

Attendees: Dale Pernula, Planning Director
John Bouslog, Property Owner
Loyd Frazier, Property Owner
Ron Wesen, Skagit County Commissioner
Carter Timmerman, WSDOT Aviation Division
Tim Holloran, Skagit County Administrator
Sara Young, Port of Skagit
Heather Haslip, Port of Skagit
Carl Molesworth, Port of Skagit
Tim Rosenhan, Skagit Airport Support Association (SASA)
Jay Findley, SASA
Gary Sturdy, SASA
David Ulane, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association
Bill Knutzen, Property Owner and Former Pilot

Dale Pernula: Well, it looks like everyone who's going to be here is here now so I think we'll begin. Skagit County has requested a formal consultation, which is a mandatory consultation. We contacted airport owners, managers, private airport operators, general aviation pilots, the Port, and Washington DOT Aviation Division about this. We provided supporting information to everyone who was invited and I hope you've taken the opportunity to take a look at that information and review it. During the consultation meeting all parties will identify the issues and concerns regarding the proposal in an effort to reach a consensus on project objectives, project alternatives, modifications, or other specific measures that avoid, minimize, or resolve potential incompatible land uses adjacent to the airport.

That's basically what the meeting is about and what we're going to be doing. I think I'd like to begin with everyone introducing themselves and what their interest is. Maybe we'll start in the back with Mr. Bouslog.

John Bouslog: John Bouslog, property owner.

Loyd Frazier: Loyd Frazier, property owner.

Ron Wesen: Ron Wesen, Skagit County Commissioner.

Carter Timmerman: Carter Timmerman, WSDOT Aviation.

Mr. Pernula: Dale Pernula, Skagit County.

Tim Holloran: Tim Holloran, County Administrator.

Sara Young: Sara Young, Port of Skagit.

Heather Haslip: Heather Haslip, Port of Skagit.

Carl Molesworth: Carl Molesworth, Port of Skagit.

Tim Rosenhan: Tim Rosenhan, Skagit Airport Support Association.

Jay Findley: Jay Findley, Skagit Airport Support Association.

Gary Sturdy: Gary Sturdy, Skagit Airport Support Association.

Mr. Pernula: Okay, I would like to go over a little bit a review of what the proposal is – what the new proposal is – and so on. So we have a PowerPoint that was prepared for a Bayview Ridge Community Meeting to be held next week, and I'll go over this real quick.

Why was an urban growth area designated for Bayview Ridge in the beginning? First of all, it was identified as the best area for urban residential and industrial development; it's out of the floodplain; it's not prime farm land; it's close to the airport, or the airport is there; and it has roads and sewer.

It was actually put on the Comprehensive Plan in 1997. A subarea plan was adopted in 2006. It was on hold for residential development until we adopted a PUD ordinance. There were appeals and a revision was adopted in 2008, and after a settlement agreement was agreed upon the subarea plan was valid. Then there was a partnership committee to develop the PUD ordinance. This is actually the adopted Subarea Plan in 2008.

Then it was proposed to change the Subarea Plan and the Commissioners shelved, for the time, a proposed PUD code. They changed 110 acres of undeveloped Residential zoning nearest the airport to Light Industrial. The Community Center – the BR-CC – was downsized to about 3 acres and the intention was to facilitate business park-style development and lead to job creation.

This is the plan that was adopted last year, and you can see that there was – this includes the 110 acres of additional industrial development and a flex area that could be changed to industrial development in the future. It also included, as did the prior plan, 281 acres of Urban Reserve to the north.

We received a couple of letters in December and January – one from the Port, one from the School District – with important information. In particular, the letter from the Port had a long recital, then, as part of the resolution, here were two of the points they made that were quite important:

Number 2: The Port Commission is committed to public safety and endorses the safety zone dimensions recommended by WSDOT and the Airport's Compatible Use Guidebook, and therefore urges Skagit County to complete an update of the AEO to adopt the most current WSDOT-recommended safety overlay zone dimensions and to amend the language of the code to (1) bring it current with FAA and WSDOT guidance on airport compatibility issues; and (2) to provide the necessary protection of the Airport to ensure its future vitality; and number (3) the Port Commission respectfully suggests that Skagit County review land use within the Bayview Ridge urban growth area and, where appropriate, adopt additional industrial land use designations for land in the UGA between Skagit Regional Airport and the existing urban density residential development on Bayview Ridge.

Now the proposal that we're making – this is the proposal – would accomplish all of those things. First, it would replace current Residential (and) change it to Light Industrial. It would designate Light Industrial to the northwest of the Airport to AVR – Aviation-Related – also in the southeast. Those allocations would be moved to the northeast part of the Subarea. And it would remove an area from the Bayview Ridge Subarea and out of the urban growth area. The removal of the unused Residential zoning would be about – and swapping it to Light Industrial – would be about 172 acres and the urban growth area would be downsized by about 235 acres. We would develop some development standards and improve traffic management and require trails and parks.

The AEO background is provided here. In 2011, WSDOT updated its Guidebook for Land Use Planning Near Airports. Skagit Regional Airport will eventually extend its main runway; as a result, existing airport protection zones will change size and shape. And because of restrictions in airport zones 4 and 6, most of the Subarea will not be able to accommodate the new residential development at urban densities that was previously planned. In both zones 4 and 6, according to the WSDOT Guidelines, to be compatible it's recommended that you have densities of one dwelling unit per 5 acres or less, or fifteen or more dwelling units per acre. These are the dimensions of both the existing AEO zones, which are shown in gold, and the proposed are shown in purple.

That's basically it. If you have any questions, let me know. Are there any questions?

(silence)

Mr. Pernula: So the next thing I would like to have is the state to provide its comments on the proposal.

Mr. Timmerman: Thank you. Thank you very much, Dale. Well, we support the proposal. It's consistent with best management practices found in our Airports and Compatible Land Use Guidebook. We also support the right sizing of the UGA and the shift from the proposed Residential zoning to the Light Industrial zoning. But I do have one question for you. In regards to the infill, in my review of the packet I noted that there's 2.84 acres of infill and that's – is that correct?

Mr. Pernula: To the southeast, yes. It is totally surrounded by existing residential development.

Mr. Timmerman: Then that would be consistent with our Guidelines to allow that infill.

Mr. Pernula: And I can show you some aerial photographs of that area.

Mr. Timmerman: I've seen – I've definitely seen it. I do have a question, or something for a consideration in regards to that – is the buffering of the Light Industrial and the Residential uses there. Is that a main arterial that would be segregating those two uses?

Mr. Pernula: No. It's just a property line.

Mr. Timmerman: That's just a property line? Okay. Well, that's definitely something that I'm sure that you'll address later. I do have a concern about the Light Industrial use. I just want to make sure that your airport overlay addresses any type of industrial negative externalities such as production of smoke, steam, and thermal blooms, because thermal blooms are something

that could affect safe air navigation. So I would recommend that you address anything such as that with your airport overlay when you're amending it to the new geometries.

Mr. Pernula: But let me respond to that real quick.

Mr. Timmerman: Yes, sir.

Mr. Pernula: We have been working with the Port to revise the AEO provisions, and I believe those were in the draft that we've been working on.

Mr. Timmerman: Excellent. Very good work. Too often those are overlooked and they can become a serious challenge for an airport. That is pretty much what I had to offer today, other than that we – WSDOT Aviation is very supportive of the changes. The airport is significant to the local economy and the state's economy. We have – the last time I estimated it was 165 based aircraft there, correct? And our economic study showed that the airport attributes to about 514 jobs. That's indirect and induced for the local economy. And as it stands, we're not getting any more airports so it's very important that we develop these resources, and I strongly support the changes that you've proposed. Thank you.

Mr. Pernula: Okay, next I'd like to get some comments from the Port.

Ms. Young: You're good! As you know, we've been working closely with the County on this proposal. We did feel that it addresses the requests made by our commissioners and their resolution from January. We've been working really hard for a number of years now to complete a significant improvement project for our airport that really prepares the airport for the next twenty years of foreseeable growth. We believe we have a tremendous asset and we need to protect it, and the way this code is shaping up and some of these land use changes that are being proposed here really are what we need in order to take care of the airport for the future. So we're very supportive of what's being proposed here and just look forward to working with the County on completing the AEO updates and working through this process.

Mr. Pernula: Okay. Well, perhaps next I should get comments from the individual who called in.

Mr. Timmerman: Mr. Ulane?

Mr. Pernula: Hello?

David Ulane: Good morning. David Ulane with the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association. Our group represents about 10,500 aircraft owners and pilots in Washington State, and we are also supportive of the changes as depicted and don't have any comments at this time.

Mr. Pernula: Okay, I guess I can open it up to anybody else who wishes to make comments. Mr. Rosenhan?

Mr. Rosenhan: Hi, this is Tim Rosenhan and I'm on the SASA board, and SASA really supports the proposed changes to the zoning around the airport as we see that it's far more compatible than the previous plan, and that we recognize that in the seventeen or so years since the original concept for a new town near the airport was proposed there have been changed conditions. And I'll just mention four of those that I think are good reasons that this plan should be implemented.

Number one is that the Aviation Division has come up with more rigorous standards surrounding airports, and this plan reflects that.

Secondly, the Port of Skagit has evolved its mission for the airport that now foresees the airport becoming much more of a business-related airport than it was previously.

Third, we can see in the last seventeen years a gathering body of evidence for conflicts around airports within the Puget Sound region between residential developments and aviation activity.

And then fourth, the – particularly with regard to the conversion of more industrial lands – both the Port and the Envision Skagit 2060 project have identified a need for more industrial land, and this would seem to answer that need.

Mr. Pernula: Okay.

Bill Knutzen: I'd like to make a little presentation here. Do you want me at a microphone or can you hear me?

Mr. Pernula: If you could, that would be easier to pick it up.

Mr. Knutzen: I'm Bill Knutzen. I spent my entire career as a military pilot and an airline pilot. I presently own land that at one time was designated Bayview Ridge Residential and now has been re-designated, or being proposed to be re-designated, as Rural Reserve.

First of all, the Port's operation yesterday with the B-17 and the B-29 – or B-24 – and P-51 was outstanding. Thank you for that. I've seen a lot of B-17s and been – but never been through one, and I now appreciate what the pilots in World War II had to go through in order to support this country. Fortunately the kind of work I did, nobody was shooting at me so that made my job a whole lot easier.

And first I'd like to thank the Port for its support for the residential component for our property at the perimeter of the Airport Environs Zone 6. We believe that a low density, residential component in that area will provide homes for families who wish to live within a walking or bicycling distance of the workplace. This is what our original vision statement in the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan states. My grandson presently works at Hexcel and lives in Sedro-Woolley. They've indicated that they would be some of the first to purchase a home on the land that our family has farmed since 1891.

The property of the Knutzen family homes is located approximately one mile east of the airport runway, just north of Peterson Road. It's ideally suited for residential development. It is not farmland; we tried that. One-fourth of the 60 acres is outside the Airport Environs – about 12 acres. It's surrounded on three sides with existing residential property and to the north on productive farmland presently farmed by Roger Knutzen's family – my brother. With proper planning, it can be some of the best view property in Skagit County. It slopes gently to the north, giving all a good view of the farmland below and the Chuckanut Mountains in the distance. The portion on the extended center line of runway 4 is outside the Airport Environs Zone 6 boundary. It is served by Burlington City Sewer Service and is the beginning of the sewer line to serve in the future the entire Bayview Ridge. Drainage has been upgraded by Drainage District 14 to accommodate this project. The District 6 fire station was built to serve this property, existing residents, and the Port. It's above the floodplain of both the Skagit and Samish Rivers. At build-out it will provide 2½ million dollars in impact fees and close to a million

dollars in annual revenue for the county – a bit above what it now collects. It accomplishes part of the task that we had all been advocating since my grandfather's time: Build homes on the hill ground and protect the farmland from development. We will be good neighbors to the airport and complement the industrial properties. I urge you to keep our property in the UGA as Bayview Ridge Residential and give us the opportunity to develop it responsibly. Thank you.

Mr. Pernula: Is there someone else who wishes to speak?

(silence)

Mr. Pernula: No one else?

Mr. Timmerman: I guess this concludes our consultation. WSDOT Aviation will provide a summary of our consultation for your public record and talking points and bullets of our points. Thank you very much.

Mr. Pernula: Okay, and I'd just like to point out that next Thursday evening, June 26th, from 6 to 8 p.m. we will be holding a Bayview Ridge Community Meeting at the school – a more generalized meeting to get input from residents and property owners in the area. And this concludes the consultation. Thank you.

Mr. Ulane: Thank you.

Mr. Timmerman: Thank you, Dale.