



MEMORANDUM

Date: February 11, 2005
To: Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan CAC and TAC
From: Aubin Phillips, Berryman & Henigar
Re: CAC meeting 2/10/05

Attendance:

CAC: Ed Goodman, Bill Dinsmoor, Chuck Manning, Tom Stowe, Mike Trafton, Tom Glade

TAC: Ross Barnes, Konrad Kurp, Ian Munce, Tony Kubena, Bob Bell, David Pearson

Consultants: Roger Wagoner, Aubin Phillips

Other: Mary Goodman, Mike Goodman

Upcoming meeting and Updates

The next CAC meeting will be held on March 10 at the Fidalgo Elementary School Library. At this meeting we will have the survey results, they have taken a little longer than expected - they were still trickling in last week, so PRR will wait to mail them on February 14. The survey got really good returns, the last count was at 436 surveys returned; this is about a 20% response rate, which is really good statistically. We have not yet seen any results since all of the surveys went to PRR.

Some of the committee members feel that it was a little confusing for the surveys to be returned to PRR instead of the county, since the community is not familiar with PRR, in the future maybe a county logo should be placed on the return envelope. Ed said that he got several calls from community members since his name was on the survey, none of the other committee members received phone calls.

The March meeting will also include a discussion of the SR 20 project – Todd Harrison of WSDOT and other staff members will be at the CAC meeting to answer questions the committees may have.

At the April CAC meeting we will break into several subgroups and work on identifying areas of specific concern such as past landslides, drainage problem areas, and land use issues using maps of public lands that have been created by Skagit GIS.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Land Use amendment proposals

We passed out two maps – one of the proposed Anacortes UGA extensions, and one of the proposed land use amendment proposals on Fidalgo for zoning changes. The first map shows in purple the areas that Anacortes would like to include in the city's UGA. There were three private proposals to the Anacortes UGA, one was accepted, one was rejected, and one was withdrawn by the applicant and instead put into the land use amendment proposals to the county for an upzone. Proposals can be made on an annual basis.

There is concern that Anacortes is only accepting commercial lands and leaving pockets of unincorporated county residential lands. There is also concern that the golf course is split in half. A specific concern is about emergency services and being able to access lands, and knowing who to contact with problems.

Ian briefly discussed Anacortes build-out capacity. Anacortes is projected to accommodate a population of 18,300 by 2025, this is the same number as last year. New population allocations were allotted to Mount Vernon and Sedro-Woolley, but not Anacortes. Anacortes is trying to keep their population small, and can't accommodate extra population from the county. They expect to be able to max out to the 18,300 population under the current zoning with their 1,200 buildable sites.

The second map has flags on the parcels that are proposed to have land use/zoning changes. Each flag shows the proposal name and a very short description of what they would like to do. Each of the proposals would like to upzone or further subdivide their property – most would like to go from Rural Reserve to Rural Intermediate, and several are located on lands adjacent to the ACFL. When looking at the numbers on these proposals, most of them do not fit within the allowable lot sizes of the proposed zoning.

The question was brought up about the difference between Rural Reserve and Rural Intermediate zoning. Handouts were sent around with descriptions of each of the zoning designations currently in place on Fidalgo Island. These descriptions are taken straight from the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan and the Skagit zoning code. Zoning matrices were also passed out. These matrices are broken into eight categories: residential, government and business, retail, resource, regional, manufacturing, recreation, and services. The top of the matrix has the zoning designations that are currently in place on Fidalgo Island, and the left side has the list of land uses. The matrix is filled in with letters that specify if the land use is permitted (P), accessory (A), an administrative special use (Ad), or a hearing examiner special use (H) in each of the zones. This information is taken directly from the Skagit County zoning code.

There was some discussion on what is rural, the survey should help us answer this question some, and there will be an exercise at the next open house that will engage the public in helping to define what they think of as rural.

The city of Anacortes does not have the power to annex or extend sewer to the rural area of Fidalgo Island, but they can provide water service. There is the question of whether the City should provide water and make it easier to develop smaller lots, for them it is just one more connection, but realistically a minimum parcel size of 2.5 acres is really needed to build on in order to meet all of the requirements.

TAC Update

Jim Mecca was not able to make it to the meeting, but Ross Barnes gave the committee an update on the last TAC meeting with Anacortes Parks. Tom Stowe also passed around his notes from this meeting.

At this meeting with Anacortes Parks there were two major discussions: what is the Anacortes Community Forest Lands (ACFL) and how will it impact Fidalgo Island and how do the rural area of Fidalgo Island and the City of Anacortes interact?

The ACFL are managed by Anacortes Parks and Recreation under a special unit. Some of the land is in the county, and not in the city, which may have some implications for the Fidalgo subarea plan. The area is a protected natural forest, there is no development allowed, it is a wild habitat with minimal recreation. It is being proposed in the new Anacortes draft CAO that the whole ACFL be a critical area as a permanent natural habitat which would require “adjacent development standards” like a 30 foot native growth buffer in the City.

The ACFL does have current acquisition interests; they have a protocol and a listing. They are trying to protect the watersheds that are located in the park, some of these extend past the park boundaries and they

would like to acquire the entire watershed area. They would like to have some better access points to the park and some connector pieces. They also have some significant ecological prospects.

The Evergreen trail was brought up in this meeting, there would be a connector through the ACFL and this would continue on into the City. The TAC will be reviewing the language in the existing County Parks Comprehensive Plan. There was discussion of calling it a trail vs. an open space corridor. There is not a need to place further restrictions, but there is concern of permanently imposing the current restrictions and where. There was mention that one of the trusts may be interested in pursuing some of this land when they know where it is. This would be voluntary instead of creating restrictions through land use and zoning codes.

It was also discussed that the committee may make recommendations through this plan such as changes in zoning, use of roads, and property acquisitions.

Open space on Fidalgo Island was discussed, and there were questions about how much is required. Roger explained that communities set their own levels of service (LOS) for open space. This is differentiated between active (recreational land) and passive (view sheds) in most communities. The TAC would like information on the acreages of critical areas, the MRO, and aquifer recharge areas.

The TAC then discussed what their next assignment should be. They are interested in pursuing non-motorized transportation and State Route 20 land acquisition. Tom Stowe has spoken with Dawn at WSDOT and she has said that late spring they will have a map of land acquisitions, and that they will be doing some mitigation. They are currently about two months behind schedule. The committee would like to have someone from the state come in and talk about what is going on, they would also like to hear from a county roads person.

Next Meeting

We will work to get some people at the March 10 CAC meeting to discuss transportation issues. This will not be a separate TAC meeting.

We would like to get some comments on the draft outline for the subarea plan. The Bayview Ridge subarea plan can be looked at as an example of a subarea plan about to be adopted by the County, the website will be sent out since this is a very large plan and cannot be handed out.

The next CAC meeting will be March 10 and will include transportation and survey results; at other future meetings we will discuss the map exercise and the next open house.