

Skagit County Planning Commission
Public Hearing: 2017 Docket of Proposed Policy, Code, and Map Amendments
April 4, 2017

Planning

Commissioners: Tim Raschko, Chair (absent)
Kathy Mitchell, Vice Chair
Annie Lohman
Hollie Del Vecchio
Tammy Candler
Josh Axthelm
Kathi Jett
Martha Rose
Amy Hughes

Staff: Dale Pernula, Planning Director
Ryan Walters, Assistant Planning Director

Public
Commenters: Hal Rooks, GIPAC/Proponent
Nancy Fox, GIPAC/Proponent
Stella Spring, GIPAC
Steve Orsini
Joni Bulfinch
Chuck Bulfinch
Rick Gillette
David Ashbach
Lowell Ashbach
Andy Culbertson
Tom Carson
Willard Aldridge

Patrick O’Hearn, Evergreen Islands
Sharon Price
Michael Price
Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County/Proponent
Richard Bergner
Allen Jett
Konrad Kurp
David Wilcoxon
David Pearson
Michele Fremont
Sheila Pritchett Mary
Rose
Diana Rollo
Roger Pierce
Roger Robinson, Proponent
Mark Tibbles
Bret Lunsford
Jan Robinson
Liz McNett Crowl
Bill Redding
Carol Ehlers
Brian Wetcher
Tom Glade
David Wallace Julia
Hurd
Thomas Conroy
Howard Gulley
Harold Harrington
Larry Becker

Chair Tim Raschko: Good evening. I’d like to call to order the April 4th, 2017, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission. Before I begin, let’s – why don’t we take a look at the agenda. Has anybody any changes, additions they would like to make?

Several Commissioners: No.

Chair Raschko: All right. The purpose of tonight’s meeting is a public hearing for the 2017 docket of proposed policy, code – policy, code, and map amendments. This is a public hearing. Everybody is welcome to sign up and speak for three minutes. Please limit your comments to a three-minute period so that everybody’ll have a chance to speak. We have a lot of people here tonight and we appreciate very much if you limit it to the two minutes. We’ll time you. If it goes over the two minutes, we’ll call for the next person. So I appreciate very much your cooperation.

Kathy Mitchell: Three minutes.

Chair Raschko: Three minutes. Did I say “two”?

Ms. Mitchell: Yes.

Chair Raschko: Ah.

(laughter)

Chair Raschko: Wishful thinking, yes! Anyway, we will call for the next person. So I appreciate your understanding and cooperation in that regard. Okay. Staff will give a brief presentation about the proposal now and then we will begin.

Dale Pernula: Okay, I'll start it over here. As mentioned, this is the 2017 docket of proposed policy, code, and map amendments for the Comprehensive Plan. The proposal consists of a little more than 20 proposed amendments to the Skagit Comprehensive Plan and land use map and development regulations. This was established by the Board of County Commissioners when they adopted their resolution on December 20th, 2016. It includes nine land use and zoning amendments, and the remainder are Comprehensive Plan narrative and policies and Skagit County Code Title 14 amendments to the Unified Development Code. The Assistant Director, Ryan Walters, has a PowerPoint that he would like to begin on this matter before we hold the public hearing.

Ryan Walters: Good evening, everybody. My name is Ryan Walters. I'm the Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services. I wanted to provide you some idea of the scope of what it is we're talking about tonight. We have about 23 proposed amendments. They're there on the screen. There will be a test later.

(laughter)

Mr. Walters: All this information is available on the website, but I wanted to let you know that there are these 23 because I kind of get the impression that a lot of you may be here to testify about one or two of them, and we're going to want you to tell us exactly which one you're testifying about so that it's not lost amongst all the others.

Twenty-three proposals were docketed by the Board of County Commissioners. Anyone can submit a proposal by the last business day of July in each year, and the Board chooses from among those proposals that come in as to which ones move forward. So now we have 23. The comment period for this package of proposals opened on March 2nd. The public hearing is tonight and the comment period for written comments ends on Thursday, April 6th, two days from now, at 4:30 p.m. If you have written comments with you tonight, we encourage you to put them in the box at the staff table. We'll stamp them in as you hand them to us. If you want to submit comments via email, you're welcome to do that. We encourage comments via email because it's very easy for us to organize. Those comments need to go to pdscomments@co.skagit.wa.us. And you'll see that email address again on these slides. And if you want more information about all the various proposals that are part of this package, they're all at the website skagitcounty.net/2017cpa, and you'll see that address again, as well.

After the public hearing tonight and after the end of that written comment period, the Department will assemble the written comments, package them up, provide them with a staff report to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission then generates a recommendation. That recommendation goes forward with any Department recommendation to the Board of County

Commissioners. The Board of County Commissioners then makes a decision on what to do: either to adopt the proposal, to make changes to the proposal, to solicit more public comment, or decline to process the proposal.

I wanted to provide some additional background information on the South Fidalgo proposal because I get the impression a lot of you may be here for that one. This is the map that was on the mailer that went out, and the area that is under discussion is the area that is orange on this map that is currently zoned Rural Reserve. The proposal is to change that orange area to South Fidalgo Rural Residential, which would be a new zone. We have gotten a lot of questions about that because some people who got the mailer per our regulations are not in the orange area; you're in the purple area or the gray area. But you get the mailer because you're within 300 feet of the orange area.

There are essentially four aspects to that proposal and so we'll want you to comment on which ones you like or dislike. First of all there's the question of creation of the zone at all, of naming a zone; there's the geographic extent of the zone – where do you want it to apply? The proposal is for all the orange area you saw there on the map. The third aspect is what uses would be allowed in the zone. And then the fourth is the question of CaRDs or Conservation and Reserve Development/cluster development. And the original proposal that came from a resident said no CaRDs. We included some options so the Planning Commission would have options as they go through their deliberations to provide their recommendation. And those four options are: allow the cluster developments with the density bonus, which is what you get under a CaRD over the standard land division format; or allow with a density bonus only when public water is available, which is what currently occurs on Guemes Island; or allow a CaRD without a density bonus, which is what currently occurs in Rural Intermediate, the purple area on the map; or do not allow CaRDs at all, which is what the original proposal included.

For the public hearing tonight we want you to say your name. We want you to say your address so we know which of you is speaking. There are many people with the same name, actually, in a small county like Skagit. And then we want you to tell us exactly what you're testifying about so that we can easily categorize your comments later. There is a three-minute limit, as was mentioned. Sharing/yielding time is not allowed. And please don't use your time to ask questions. If you have questions that you want to ask in the rhetorical sense, feel free, but then move along so that you make full use of your three minutes. And staff and Planning Commissioners and others are available either tonight or anytime you want to give us a call or here at the counter to answer other questions.

Again, your written comment period ends in two days: staff table, email, or postal mail, and I'll leave this screen up so that until it gets replaced by somebody else's PowerPoint you'll have that onscreen and you can write that down. Also feel free to ask us for any additional information if you need it. All right?

Any initial questions from the Planning Commission?

Ms. Mitchell: I have one. Could you please do a brief overview on what the Growth Management Hearing Board's decision was on whether the South Fidalgo area plan needed to be done or not?

Mr. Walters: Oh, there was a question that came up in the last couple of weeks as we were all contemplating this proposal. There was a challenge to the County's adoption of its Comprehensive Plan way back when – maybe 2002. And that challenge resulted in the County promising to do a subarea plan for South Fidalgo Island, among other places. The County ultimately did not really complete a subarea plan for South Fidalgo, but the County made other changes to its development regulations to remove the need to do that plan in order to be compliant with GMA. So that case has been closed. The Growth Management Hearings Board found that the County was compliant even without doing a subarea plan.

Ms. Mitchell: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Okay, we'll begin with the public testimony. We have 29 people who have signed up to speak. They are on numbered pages so I'm going to go through in numerical order. Hopefully that represents the order in which people signed up. So first would be Hal Rooks, followed by Nancy Fox.

Hal Rooks: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Hal Rooks. My address is 5971 Upper Hollow Lane on Guemes Island. I'm Chairperson of the Guemes Island Planning Advisory Committee, which we call GIPAC. You'll hear references to that. GIPAC has a number of members and supporters in the audience tonight. GIPAC fully supports proposal P-7 in the 2017 docket of the Comprehensive Plan policy, code, and amendments as presented by the County Planning Department. Proposal P-7 would amend the County zoning code chapter 1418 – 14.18 – to require permanent protection of any open space designated through a CaRD – a Conservation Reserve Development, as Mr. Walters just explained – a CaRD subdivision on Guemes Island. This code amendment would implement policy 4.21 of the adopted Guemes Island Subarea Plan, a policy which was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners in 2011 that has not yet been codified. This code change is consistent with existing code, Skagit County Code 14.18.310 chapter 2, which states that there is no density bonus for CaRD developments on Guemes because the entire island is dependent on a sole source aquifer. We appreciate the County's – County Planning Department's recommendation to approve the GIPAC-proposed amendment to permanently protect open space in a CaRD and we ask that the Planning Commission also recommend approval.

That said, while we support the proposed P-7 as far as it goes, I want to give you a heads-up about a concern of ours that we became aware of after our amendment was docketed by the Department, and we therefore – we're not able to address it in this year's submission. We intend to address this concern in next year's 2018 Comp Plan cycle. The code amendment proposed in the 2017 docket would prohibit additional houses in a designated CaRD open space; however, as you know, CaRD open space is assigned one of six open space categories existing in the CaRD code, which is 14.18.310 chapter 5, which allow a wide variety of non-residential uses, particularly in the Rural Reserve zone. Many of these potential uses are ones we consider incompatible with the concept of open space on Guemes. These include everything from indoor recreational facilities to kennels to bed-and-breakfasts to motor bike mechanized vehicles, such as dirt bikes and ATVs. In our view, these uses are plainly inconsistent with the concept of open space on Guemes.

To sum up, Guemes – excuse me – GIPAC would like to see the CaRD process remain a viable tool for environmentally sensitive development on Guemes; however, we also want to keep CaRD open space predominantly free of buildings – i.e., truly “open” – while retaining flexibility for

property owners to make use of their open land for low impact uses such as agriculture and outdoor recreation.

Again, we support proposal P-7 in this year's docket and we thank you for your consideration.

(Timer rings.)

Ms. Mitchell: Couldn't be more perfect, Hal.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Now Nancy Fox followed by Stella Spring.

Nancy Fox: Good evening. My name's Nancy Fox and my address is 7202 Channel View Drive, which is on Guemes. I, too, am a member of GIPAC and immediate past President of the group – past Chair.

I'd just like to echo the comments that Hal provided and note again that GIPAC is in favor of the code change that's identified as P-7 in the docket. The title is "Require permanent protection of CaRD open space on Guemes Island. This code provision was recommended in the Guemes Island Subarea Plan, that plan having been adopted by the Board of Commissioners six years ago. And we are anxious to see it put into the code. We thought actually that it was going to be included in the docket last year when the Guemes Island Zoning Overlay was being considered, but apparently it slipped through the cracks and so we're glad to see that it's being picked up this year to be part of the 2017 docket.

As Hal suggested, the specific language in P-7 does not provide the full protection for CaRD open space that the Guemes plan envisioned, but we think it's a really good first step and we would like to work with you next year on getting some refinement to that language to do a more complete job of meeting the intent of the Guemes plan.

I wanted to add just a personal observation about CaRDs, based on my own experience in planning. I was a professional planner for over 30 years and during that time I became very aware that clustering of development in the rural area is not without controversy. In fact, it's controversial in many places and there are many areas that have argued against clustering altogether. And that is – that's something that, you know, I see a little bit differently. I see that CaRDs can be a really good tool for both developers and in terms of protecting environmental values on a site. So I was personally very glad to see that the Guemes plan – the people who put together the Guemes plan saw that it was a good idea to continue allowing CaRDs on Guemes Island. The proposals that we have made this year and that we're going to come back with next year are not an attempt to undo the CaRD provisions but really just a proposal to adjust them, adapt them to what we think is very sensitive island environment because of our sole source aquifer.

So thank you for your consideration and we hope that you'll support policy P-7. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Next is Stella Spring. She'll be followed by Steve Orsini.

Stella Spring: Good evening. My name is Stella Spring and I'm also a board member on the Guemes Island Planning and Advisory Committee. My address is 5185 South Shore Drive.

I grew up in the Pacific Northwest and I've seen firsthand the benefits of environmental policy. I believe that the CaRD process can be helpful to developers and support long-term conservation interests. CaRDs give the flexibility to achieve full developmental potential while ensuring environmental sensitivity. I fully support GIPAC's proposed P-7 amendment requiring permanent protection of any open space designated through a CaRD on Guemes Island. The proposed P-7 CaRD amendment is contained in the Guemes Island Subarea Plan, which the County Commissioners approved in 2011 but never codified. It is past time. The P-7 amendment deserves to be codified. I appreciate the County's Planning Department has shown support for approval. I also ask that the Planning Commission recommend approval. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Steve Orsini, please, followed by Joni Bulfinch.

Steve Orsini: My name is Steve Orsini. I live at 4971 Guemes Island Road. That's 98221. And I'm here to speak in support of P-7 plus. And by "plus" I mean both Guemes and South Fidalgo are islands in the San Juans and we face similar problems, and I want to address the fact that often there's concern that these islands are asking for policies that are different from the rest of Skagit County and I want to give you the background of *why* they are different, and I also want to address the fact that we've been suffering under a taking for a long time – 23 years.

That's Guemes Island. You can see it's surrounded by saltwater. In '94 – 1994 – there was a hydrogeologic study completed of Guemes Island. It was very comprehensive. It was very important in terms of how the island aquifers work. But what you need to know here tonight is that when you reduce the natural head height of these island aquifers one foot in the middle, seawater comes up 40 feet and that's why we have such severe problems with seawater intrusion.

This was '94 – areas of identified seawater intrusion already existing on Guemes Island through the study by USGS.

These are the wells that have failed on Guemes in the areas as identified: seven wells on North Beach and a major system here called "Potlatch" where two wells failed that were serving 30 hookups. So I'm one of the lucky people who had a failed well, and this is what happens to your chlorides when you put in seven new wells within a half-a-mile diameter but inland from your well. As you can see, we had background chlorides that were in the 30 range – milligrams per liter – and within a few years it sawtooths up and we were above 250 milligrams per liter, which is the maximum contaminant level set by the EPA in the state of Washington.

So what does that mean? Where we are today is over – since the '94 study and the failure of the wells I talked about which went through '98, 38 more wells have been drilled on the north end of Guemes Island. It exacerbates the problem. And what it means is that you are transferring, for example, my senior water right to the next fellow in who buys property close or inland and puts in a well. You don't need a permit to drill a well in Skagit County or on Guemes Island. You don't have to do anything but put the well in. And then you can start pumping and you don't have to show what the effects are for the people who are closer to the sea.

So, in summary, I want to say only new wells are measured for chloride. Failed wells are not recorded. No measurement of adjacent wells is undertaken.

(Timer rings.)

Mr. Orsini: And the water rights that I once had have been given to somebody else, and I call that a taking.

Chair Raschko: Joni Bulfinch and next will be Chuck Bulfinch.

Joni Bulfinch: Hi, I'm Joni Bulfinch. I live at 13079 Satterlee Road in Anacortes. I live in the Rural Reserve area and I'm here to speak against the South Fidalgo Island request to eliminate CaRDs. I grew up in Skagit County. Most of my life has been spent in the country living area. That's why we bought where we did, raised a family where we did, and gave some land to our son.

Local property owners currently near where I live are already in a tug-of-war over land rights within the Swinomish Indian tribe wanting to include us in the boundary of their reservation. I am *not* in favor of the CaRD and density bonus reduction. My husband and I have already made boundary line adjustments at a considerable expense to accommodate for a CaRD with density bonus for the future of an additional family member. In order to do this, the County must keep the CaRD with the density bonus or our efforts will be for naught. Again, this is taking land rights away from those of us that chose to buy in excess of 10 acres, pay the taxes, and manage our property based on current zoning.

As far as the issue of water, the City of Anacortes is a purveyor of water. They sell water, they want to sell water. That's the business they're in. Currently on South Fidalgo Island there are 442 water meters currently in the South Fidalgo Island area. Del Mar's on public water, and we – out where I'm talking about living – are on PUD water. There's a lot of PUD water. Our property borders two roads. Both roads are on public water. The public water issue is already addressed in the CaRD. Talks about whether or not you're on public water, whether or not there's a sole aquifer.

Some facts are: There were 999 property owners notified regarding this change. About 100-plus property owners own 10 or more acres, which totals about 2222 acres. 10,244 acres are already protected within this area with the city forestlands, Deception State Park, and the Sares Bluff. Only two CaRDs – two – were put into play between the years 2005 to 2015. If there is a sole source aquifer in that area, I've not been able to find the report that determines that that is true at this point in time.

The CaRD is already working. It's not just for developers. It's for family members like ourselves that are trying to give our children, our nephews a piece of property to live on. And, actually, with the Swinomish tribe thing going on, we might not even be able to give our property away. I mean, there's going to be a casino down on the corner. So whether or not we're encircled into the tribe or there's a casino, we can't sell it.

(Timer rings.)

Ms. Bulfinch: We want to give it to our kids.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Ms. Bulfinch: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Chuck Bulfinch, followed by Rick Gillette.

Chuck Bulfinch: Yeah, hi. I'm Chuck Bulfinch. I live at 13079 Satterlee Road. I'm speaking of the South Fidalgo Rural Reserve zone and the CaRD with the density bonus. This follows a little bit of what my wife was just saying.

You know, I bought the property in 1972 – 27 acres on Satterlee Road. I have paid taxes, raised a family, and seen several zoning changes. About five years ago we did a boundary line adjustment, allowing my son to have 10 acres to create a life and home for his family. Our homes are clustered on the far southwest corner of the collective 27 acres. The new boundary lines were carefully planned under our current Rural Reserve zoning. All of this came at considerable time, effort, and expense. Plans were made to possibly use the CaRD with density bonus for an additional family member. We have made plans under our current zoning. Please don't take our current land zoning rights away. The properties are served by PUD water so no solo source aquifer issue here. We put water back into the aquifer. Every time we take a shower it comes from Skagit – the Skagit River.

South Fidalgo Island Rural Residential zone has a number of acceptable housekeeping use changes; however, removing the CaRD with density bonus is not acceptable at all. This would have a direct impact on property owners with 10 or more acres. It would change a zoning right which has been in place for many years. This program has been handling rural growth in an acceptable manner. It is already working. Please leave the CaRD with density bonus alone. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Rick Gillette, and be followed by David Asbech. Asbach.

Rick Gillette: Rick Gillette, 6004 South Campbell Lake Road, Anacortes. I, too, am against any changes to the CaRD. I live on 17 acres and it seems restrictive. And I'm all for saving South Fidalgo, but I think I'm one of the property owners that *has* saved it. Living on 17 acres, I haven't used my land for anything but planting plants. But it restricts me in the future to either break off a piece of my property because I'm at 17 acres. All around my property on all four sides there are density levels *less* than 10 acres. So I kind of object to people on South Fidalgo who have less than 10 acres telling the people with more than 10 acres what to do with their property. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, David Asbach. Ashbach?

David Ashbach: Ashbach.

Chair Raschko: Ashbach. I'm sorry. Followed by Lowell Ashbach.

Mr. (David) Ashbach: That's David Ashbach, 5462 Guemes Island Road. C-19. And Steve Orsini made it pretty easy to defend them changing there to a Rural Business from Rural Residential. It's right in the middle of the saltwater intrusion, the wells that have gone bad. I don't – it says it's a technical mapping error. I've been around there for 50 years. I never saw it go through any process to change from Rural Residential to Rural Business. It's a water-intense business that they have there and want. East North Beach is a water association that they get water from.

They've had that for 25-plus years and in their statements to Washington State under Water Facilities Inventory form there's *never* been a business there. Never. And water's the critical issue for that process that they use for etching.

That's it. I'm against it. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Lowell Ashbach, followed by Andy Culbertson.

Lowell Ashbach: Hello there. I'm Lowell Ashbach. I live at 5538 Guemes Island Road. I wish to address C-19. I think the committee here will know that I previously sent an email voicing my objections to that. I trust that you have that. I don't want to repeat that. I'll be brief.

Mr. Riordan is the owner of the parcel that is subject to this proposed amendment or whatever. That parcel is one of 18 or 20 other parcels along North Beach of Guemes that are served by *one* well that's 27 feet deep. It produces three gallons a minute and has a maximum storage of 1350 gallons, and that is to be shared amongst the 18 or 20 other member-users. I am a member-user for – I'm a trustee on one of those other parcels and the Eaton Trust, of which I'm a co-trustee, strongly opposes this because this would be an attempt to usurp some of the domestic shared water coming from this limited, insufficient water system that is known as East North Beach Community Water System. And we really don't want one member to get an ability to use that money for business purposes when the rest of us are using it for limited domestic purposes.

I went through – with my brother, we went through two-and-a-half years of litigation brought by East North Beach Community Water System against my brother, and Judge Bowden in Everett ruled that that system only produces three gallons a minute with 1350 gallons of storage. I would be really reluctant if I were a Commissioner to allow Mr. Riordan to come in there for any business purpose. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Andy Culbertson. After that would be Tom Carson.

Andy Culbertson: And my name's Andy Culbertson. I live at 5909 Campbell Lake Road. I've been a resident of Fidalgo Island since August 30th, 1964, and I've lived in my present residence since 1989.

I'm against the proposal in the South Fidalgo rezone. As a resident of the area, I too wish there were less people living there, as stated in the letter sent to the Commissioners. But I think the letter is disingenuous. I looked up these – 11 of the signatories to the November 4th, 2015, letter sent to the Commissioners. Nine out of the 11 were under the 10-acre parcel size that they'd like to have in the rezone. Only two were over. One of them was a third of an acre. Several of them were tiny. Many of them were bought recently. In fact, the person writing the cover letter to it was – has put in for and, I think, gotten an addition to their house, which means using more water. The reason they say they want to keep the – or change the zoning is they say, "We're not in favor of an increase in density in South Fidalgo as it ruins the rural character." Well, they've already ruined the rural character if they're buying these small parcels and putting houses on them. And also they say we're hurting for water in these areas. Well, then why put on an extra room on your house? You're going to use more water. Again disingenuous. And then the things they want to hold out from this area are anaerobic digester, manure lagoons. Is this only to keep more development out as a backdoor way to keep development at a certain level?

I perfectly understand saying this is what I like to see out my window. But as a property owner, I feel that other property owners should have the same ability to control their destiny they had when they bought that piece of property. So for those reasons I'm against it and I would like to see the real reason that some people are for it. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Tom Carson and then Willard Aldridge.

Tom Carson: My name's Tom Carson. I live at 14188 Madrona Drive in Anacortes. I have a number of comments but I'm going to skip over those and talk only about water.

Listening to testimony so far it feels as if what we're ending up with is a conflict between property rights and water. And I want to lift up the water issues as probably the most significant issue on South Fidalgo Island. I'm the President of the Sunset West Water Association. We have three wells, 35 connections, approval for 46, a water right dated 1970. We pump two million gallons of water a year and in the next five to 10 years we're going to be faced with six or seven more connections, which means a 20% increase in water. I assume that we have something akin to a senior water right. In 2012, we completed a quarter-million-dollar upgrade on our system. Our static water levels remain remarkably consistent. And in 2007 we completed a wellhead protection plan approved by the State and County agencies.

To use the term "aquifer" is somewhat misleading because it's really not an underground pool. We're dealing with fractured rock. Water migrates five to 10 years to our well site. Our hydrologist concluded that we have a limited, delicate, and fragile resource. In 2014 we had several bad coliform tests. Either our wells were stressed or there was a change in the aquifer or both, and we needed to chlorinate. During the next two years we're going to be studying the recovery rates of our wells in relationship to storage capacity and residential use. Now we could connect to City water. There's no question. It's been commented about that. We don't have a million-and-a-half dollars to do that unless you want to, as the County, come up with a million-and-a-half dollars to get water out there for all of the residents. So that's not an issue – an option for us. We like what we have and we would appreciate it if in whatever deliberations you go through in planning for further development you bear in mind that density __ your property rights is going to affect the aquifer unless a viable alternative is provided. We would ask respectfully that you pay attention to the required wellhead protection plans that have been filed with the County. We also would suggest that a hydrological study be done to determine the nature and extent of the aquifer or aquifers, along with a determination of the amount of available water in any given period. And – *and* single source aquifer or not, study the recharge rates of those waters. Finally, determine the quality of that water because there's some evidence that the recharge level is dropping and the quality of the water is dropping. So please study water as a priority in any change in zonings or any permitting process. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, William Aldridge.

Willard Aldridge: Willard.

Chair Raschko: And then Patrick O'Hare.

Mr. Adlridge: My name is Willard Adlridge. I reside at 13207 Satterlee Road. I have two other residences on Gibraltar Road. I'm not in this zone, but I'm commenting with respect to P12, Pdash-12.

It would probably be beneficial to me financially if more restrictions were put on some of the surrounding property owners; however, I have not heard a clear interpretation of what would happen if, for example, an owner has two separate tax parcels of five acres that are adjoining, or perhaps he has four separate tax parcels of two-and-a-half acres, making up 10 acres, how the County would interpret his use of that property in the future under P-dash-12. Would he be able to build two residences on two parcels of five acres under this proposal? Or would he be able to build four single-family residences on four two-and-a-half-acre tax parcels that he's been paying tax on for the past years under the current zoning? This has not been made clear to me. I think this is a very restrictive proposal. I think it constitutes a taking of property rights and therefore I'm against it.

Chair Raschko: Patrick O'Hare?

Patrick O'Hearn: O'Hearn.

Chair Raschko: O'Hearn. Okay. Thank you. Followed by Sharon Price.

Mr. O'Hearn: My name is Patrick O'Hearn. I live at 11039 Post Drive in Anacortes. I'm a Director of Evergreen Islands and I'm speaking on behalf of Evergreen Islands as well as myself personally in support of the proposed amendment P-7 to the Guemes area Comprehensive Plan.

This amendment recognizes that Guemes Island has a sole source aquifer which limits its growth potential. The proposal, as was noted by some people earlier, had been proposed to be docketed for the 2016 Update; however, the Planning Department inadvertently omitted the item from the Update. The proposal's inclusion in the 2017 update will correct this omission and will clarify any open space designated through a CaRD be granted permanent protection. Guemes is not in an urban growth area and a sole source aquifer cannot support large amounts of future urban development.

In support of the amendment, I have submitted written documentation. I won't go over that in detail. I would like to point out that in those written materials there are two letters that I'd like to summarize briefly for you. The May 1994 Department of Ecology letter to the then-existent Skagit County Department of Public Health: The letter clearly outlined the danger to the Guemes Island aquifer that would be caused by too many wells, especially around the perimeter of the island where most of the development was taking place. Increased development supported by an increased number of water wells resulted in intrusion of saltwater into the aquifer. As long ago as 1994, the Department of Ecology recognized chlorine intrusion was taking place, especially on the north end of the island.

The second letter is an August 2010 letter from Evergreen Islands to the Skagit County Planning and Development Services, in re the Guemes Area Sub-Plan, which clearly states the present danger to the sole source aquifer created by over-pumping, especially around the edges of the island.

Both of those letters make it clear that the future of Guemes Island water supply is highly dependent – that the future of Guemes Island water supply is highly dependent on future water use, and future growth must be limited by those constraints. To this end, recognition that CaRD-related open space be preserved as open space is a necessary amendment to the Guemes Subarea Plan. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Sharon Price, and next would be Michael Price.

Sharon Price: My name is Sharon Price. I live on 5757 State Route 20, south of Campbell Lake. I am – want to talk about the concern on the limitations on the new zoning on SFRR. The restrictions that my concern is basically on is the animal rights. I'm an animal lover. I'm an advocate for animals and I do agility. I'm a therapy dog and I would love the opportunity at some point to have, like – the restrictions are listed as animal preserve, day use boarding kennels, animal clinic, hospitals, and off-vehicle use, which I also do. So I think that our area is really good for the community and the tourists and animals in general. So limiting that and the property, my limitation, I think, is against what, you know, our area's all about – is having fun and enjoying animals and having animals be able to do things. So I just want to be real brief and say please let me be able to do things with my dog on my property. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Michael Price and then Ellen Bynum.

Michael Price: Hello. My name is Michael Price. I live at 5757 State Route 20, south of Campbell Lake and east of Pass Lake. We have about four acres there on the property so I sympathize with these folks that have got water right issues that are having issues with their wells and things like that. The South Fidalgo Rural Reserve is the portion that I want to comment on.

Our property is served by Anacortes city water but yet we are lumped into a rezoning that affects few but also impacts the many, if you follow what I'm saying. I mean, it doesn't seem right. Some folks have made comments about land taking. I totally feel the same way. Land rights – the County accepts this, and the way it's written they're taking my rights away. They're devaluing my property that I've paid taxes on for the last 15 years. There's some uses in their proposal that I kind of understand. You know, the manure processing and things of that nature, I don't think anybody would want that on the island. That's not appropriate for where we live. The County – Skagit County as a whole does a great job at monitoring themselves. The Planning Commission has done great. The road crew has – I can't say enough about the road crew. Great people. But to allow a few people to rezone and basically, like I said, take property away from those of us that have paid that aren't affected by it is wrong. They've listed in their proposal campgrounds, kennels, animal preserves, and off-road vehicle use. That's – the off-road vehicle use to me, the way they have it listed is very vague. It's not specific enough to where if they're talking about, like, a Walker Valley ORV Park I understand that. But if they're talking about the fact that I can't ride my quad on my four acres of property, I have a problem with that. Also my wife and I have talked about when we get ready to retire, which is down the road here pretty quick, maybe starting up a doggie daycare or maybe a possible kennel – you know, overnight kennel use. I've got four acres surrounded by other folks that are well in excess of the 10-acre minimum that you're talking about. That type of use for my particular property would not be affected one way or another. If you pass this, that tells me I can't do what I want to do with my property in my retirement, and there's enough restrictions in life and enough heartache that everybody goes through to have the County and a few people tell me that I can't do that. That's wrong. I think if they need to rewrite this, or

the County needs to narrow it down in scope to where if folks are included in city water or public-provided water – not on a well –

(Timer rings.)

Mr. Price: – that these restrictions don't apply to them. Thank you for your time.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Ellen Bynum, followed by Richard Bergner.

Ellen Bynum: Good evening, Commissioners. Ellen Bynum. I am the Director of Friends of Skagit County, 110 North First, Mount Vernon. For those of you that don't know, Friends of Skagit County is a volunteer advocacy group that was started 23 years ago and we monitor land use decisions that the County has made, and we've done 68 issues, 33 appeals, all but three of which we prevailed on and three were settled. So part of the reason Skagit County looks the way it does is because a lot of members, some of whom I see in the room, and other people have worked hard on getting the County to comply with the Comprehensive Plan.

I will submit written information via the web – the pdscomments, as well as the ones that I want to talk about.

First I'd like to correct a statement and withdraw a statement that we made in previous testimony in December where we urged the County to place the CaRD inside of UGAs. My mistake. UGAs should have urban levels of service and CaRDs should be located so as not to interfere with the UGA's city annexations or the future expansion of UGAs as needed. A good example is in Sedro-Woolley now where we've got a whole subdivision with one-acre lots and septic, and the cost of redeveloping that to make it urban level of service is prohibitive.

I'll speak first on the – saying that I do support GIPAC's proposal. And we think that islands are different entities than the rest of the county and they *do* deserve special treatment and special regulations. So we support what you're trying to do there, especially with regard to water usage.

On the P-12 South Fidalgo rezone proposal, we would support the rezone proposal but with a moratorium on CaRDs until the County could determine that South Fidalgo is *not* a single source aquifer and/or come up with a plan to determine what the carrying capacity might be for the island. We would like to request that we put back in the subarea plan idea, because even though the Growth Management Hearings Board ruled that the County did not have to do a subarea plan, a subarea plan might be really useful for some of the things that I'm hearing here. The *Abenroth* decision said that the rezones outside of UGAs for commercial and manufacturing uses interfere with the RCW as well as their violation of Countywide Planning Policies. So for existing uses I think there is some confusion as to how a new rezone might affect an existing use, and I think that people need to get clarity on that and the County probably needs to provide some information on that.

The only use that is expressly incompatible with rural lands under GMA is urban development. So resource-based uses don't constitute urban growth and are therefore not prohibited in rural areas. So any expansion of existing –

(Timer rings.)

Ms. Bynum: – commercial-industrial must comply with the GMA. And on the CaRDs, we think –

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Ellen.

Ms. Bynum: Yeah – we think that CaRDs should be limited.

Chair Raschko: Richard Bergner, and after Richard is Allen Jett. Jett?

Richard Bergner: My name is Richard Bergner. I live at 15515 Yokeko Drive on Fidalgo Island. I'm commenting on P-12. I grew up on Fidalgo Island near Lake Campbell. I was away from Fidalgo Island for many years. I saw what poor planning can do to other areas of the country. I came back in 1994 and currently live on South Fidalgo.

I support the P-12 South Fidalgo proposal, which makes common sense changes to some of the commercial and industrial approved uses. I want South Fidalgo to maintain its rural character and high quality of life for now and for future generations. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Allen Jett, and then Konrad Kurp.

Allen Jett: My name's Allen Jett and I live at 3684 Rosario Crest Lane. In response to the rezone project here, we sent out an advisory ballot to the same list that the County sent out all of the notifications. To date we – well, we sent out almost a thousand. It was 996. To date we've gotten back 129 ballots in favor of the rezone and 53 ballots against it. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Konrad Kurp, followed by David Wilcoxon.

Konrad Kurp: Konrad Kurp, South Fidalgo Island, speaking to the proposal 12, putting some restrictions on existing allowed uses on the zoning. Step back in time. The great effort over years in the past to create a comprehensive development plan failed. I was part of that effort and it failed because some people saw that they wouldn't get what they wanted – subdivision density increases, what have you. They would not be allowed to do as they wanted to with the land in their care. Now here I digress a little bit because it's striking me as a widespread misunderstanding of what private property means as far as land is concerned. You cannot do what you want with the land in your care. You need to consider what is appropriate, tolerable, not harmful to the land, people, and environment or the air, soil, et cetera. And for some people it has to be spelled out. They don't get it. So I have seen my share of crazy proposals for Skagit County and South Fidalgo Island. I'm living in this area for 45 years and Fidalgo's – the reason – that was the reason I was part of the planning effort for years. It did not come to fruition.

So I see this proposal, P-12, as it is now under consideration, as desirable. It puts some sensible restrictions on the existing development options. We should do more, certainly much more. The water resource is questionable on Fidalgo Island and no matter what the City of Anacortes wants to do, they still want to sell water. Somebody has to put the pipe in, and that's a big item. The density of the population on South Fidalgo Island is critical if you want to preserve what you have there. If it's going to be rural, you have to watch how many people you put in there. And CaRD development with a bonus – density bonus –

(Timer rings.)

Mr. Kurp: – is basically a circumvention of density restrictions. And that is what _____.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Kurp: Okay.

Chair Raschko: David Wilcoxon. Did I get your name right?

Mr. Kurp: Thank you.

David Wilcoxon: Good evening. My name is David Wilcoxon and I'm – we have property, 7337 Miller Road in Anacortes, Pioneer Trails RV Resort, and I'm here to talk about the – obviously the P-17, the South Fidalgo rezoning issue. And we're certainly against it. We have a large RV park there which we have owned and maintained for 17-odd years, and it's been in existence since 1973, I believe. And we've always coexisted with everyone and had a really, we think, a fairly good relation with our neighbors and everything. We run a very tidy ship. Anybody that's ever been there knows that it's very well maintained, very well kept. And we have put millions of dollars into that park and into the economy, the local economy, and we will vigorously defend our property right to be able to do that. We have 27 acres there and we do not – you know, we're not litigious people. We don't want to do that. But we will vigorously defend that. And I am – we're against it and we hope that the other people that are against it will join us to make sure it doesn't happen. Thank you very much.

Chair Raschko: David Pearson, followed by Charles Davis.

David Pearson: Good evening. I'd like to thank the Commissioners for taking my testimony this evening. My name is David Pearson. I live at 6389 Deer Lane on South Fidalgo Island. In 2003, when the County Commissioners kicked off the 2005 subarea plan, they selected me to serve on one of their technical committees. And so I worked quite a bit on the technical aspects of the plan, things that we've been talking about tonight about water and sewage and runoff and everything. In 2006, as a result of that effort, a draft plan was published by the CAC – the Citizens Advisory Committee – and in that draft plan on pages 13 and 14 they mention a number of commercial and industrial uses that they thought should be prohibited from being used on South Fidalgo. So this has come up before. Now the plan was never approved but the documentation exists of the plan. It's about 60 pages plus a lot of notes and stuff attached. When the plan started to fall apart, the people on South Fidalgo Island realized that representation of those citizens really wasn't happening so they went out and formed what they called the South Fidalgo Community Council. That was seven people. They were elected by the residents in a ballot measure with all the measures that you'd do an election, and I was granted one of those positions. So I turned out to be the only person on South Fidalgo Island – ___ the world – that had served on both of those committees and for some time time, both of them at the same time. So I have a unique understanding of all of these issues and all of the things we went through.

Late in 2008 the County Commissioners decided to shut it down. They disbanded the Citizens Committee and the Technical Committee and things sort of went dark for a long time. I found out

tonight that they in fact had negotiated something that the citizens had no knowledge of to settle this.

So now we have another opportunity. What we're facing now, P-12, I would say is not perfect because we've seen prior things to try to do this, but I think it's a very good start for getting us back on the right track. I think it will assure the community that South Fidalgo remain primarily residential. I think we can take a very big step forward by approving the new South Fidalgo Rural Residential zoning and prohibiting some of these uses that we've known about for many, many years that we need to get on to this.

I want to thank Roger Robinson for bringing these efforts forward, and I'm hoping that we can get some closure and finally have a plan that the people know about, the people have seen, and the people have confirmed. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Charles Davis and then Michele Fremont.

Male voice in the audience: Charles Davis has ____.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Michele Fremont, and next would be Sheila Pritchett.

Michele Fremont: I hadn't really planned on speaking. My name is Michele Fremont, address P.O. Box 941, Anacortes. I'm here to support P-12 and the rezone. I believe that most of these uses should not be allowed; however, they might be refined a little bit with some common sense. I heard – I can't remember their names, though – speaking. Perhaps people who want to have a small doggie daycare, you know, that could be considered. But overall I am in support of P-12 and the rezone to South Fidalgo Rural Residential. And that's it.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Ms. Fremont: And I just want to say one more thing. I don't think anybody has ever regretted preserving open space or rural lands. I don't think anybody would say, I'm really sorry we don't have the forestlands.

Chair Raschko: Sheila Pritchett, followed by Maureen Scheetz.

Sheila Pritchett: Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. I want to talk about P-12, the South Fidalgo proposal. My name is Sheila Pritchett. I live on Deer Lane on South Fidalgo Island.

Many residents here tonight are speaking about the proposed amendment, for and against, about the quality of their life by reducing the permitted industrial and commercial uses. I would like to take a different approach: the wise and most efficient use of a finite resource known as our tax dollars. No one builds a structure planning to add a foundation later. Neither should the County provide a structure via the permit process for more industrial-commercial uses without providing the necessary foundation first. If the County cannot afford the investment in studies and in infrastructure, then it should not permit any future industrial-commercial uses on Fidalgo Island. New commercial-industrial uses scattered haphazardly around the Rural Reserve would require massive infrastructure investment, especially in roads, water, and drainage. The local residents should not be expected to just suck up more traffic, declining well water, and increased stormwater

runoff. Just two examples: water. If the County cannot afford an aquifer study, how can it afford water lines to bring outside water when our wells fail due to increased development or industrial-commercial uses that use a lot of water? Drainage: The 2010 stormwater drainage study lists the expense of fixing some then-existing problems, and it wasn't cheap. More impermeable surfaces will only make this problem worse and more expensive to fix.

Finally, applications for non-residential uses are often vigorously fought by local residents. These disputes not only consume time and money, they foster hostility between neighbors and distrust between the residents and the County. By clearly defining what is not acceptable, permit applications for such uses should decrease, saving time and money for all. Most South Fidalgo residents want to remain residential. We only ask that the County – that we not be a dumping ground for non-residential, compatible uses or the higher density housing.

Save the County some money, keep the majority of your residents happy. Please approve this amendment. Thank you. It's not perfect, but it's a really good start.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Maureen Scheetz, followed by Mary Rose.

Maureen Scheetz: I'd like to pass and let someone from South Fidalgo go ahead and speak.

Chair Raschko: Well, I think we need to go in the order of people signed up.

Ms. Scheetz: That'd be Mary Rose, then.

Chair Raschko: Mary Rose, please. And after Mary Rose it'd be Diana Rollo. Is there anybody that wanted to speak and wasn't able to sign up? The last number we have is 66, John Bame. I'm sorry I'm butchering everybody's names but it's my ability to read the handwriting. But it looks like John Bame from Yokeko Drive in Anacortes.

John Bame: I'll pass.

Chair Raschko: Okay, well, you're the last anyway.

Mr. Bame: I'll give my time to somebody else. _____.

Chair Raschko: All right. Well, anyway, okay.

Annie Lohman: We're not at the end, sir.

Chair Raschko: I guess the question was if there was anybody that wasn't able to sign up who still wished to. So we'll move on then with Diana Rollo.

Unidentified female voice in the audience: Mary Rose.

Mary Rose: Mary Rose.

Chair Raschko: I thought Mary chose not to speak.

Ms. Rose: No, I did not.

Ms. Scheetz: That was Maureen Scheetz.

Chair Raschko: Pardon me?

Ms. Scheetz: Maureen Scheetz is passing it to Mary Rose.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Mary Rose. I'm sorry.

Ms. Rose: Okay, I'll do my best.

Chair Raschko: All right. I'll try harder.

Ms. Rose: I'm Mary Rose. I live at 5477 Campbell Lake Road and I've been there since 1976. And I've tried to keep my property – which is only six acres and was zoned in because it was already there for a hundred years – I've kept it as a nature preserve. It has a large amount of very vigorous and happy wildlife on it, and I'd like to try to preserve that because I truly love it and I think it's a value to the community.

I wanted to speak for the consequences of putting more and more people into a small area without provision for the creatures that are already there. And if anyone's interested, the *New Yorker* magazine of February 13th and 20th has an amazing review of what happened in the Los Angeles area in the Santa Monica Mountains when they simply let people move in according to their zoning plan and keep livestock. They had an enormous problem with cougars. And we have lots of cougars in our area. They've been seen in my driveway. They've been seen on Heart Lake Road. They don't bother us at all. They're very elusive and they do their best not to bother us.

But in Los Angeles, in the Los Angeles area, where they've simply been crowded by putting more and more people on property and more and more livestock on property there's been a continuous series of conflicts. The most famous of these is perpetuated by a puma, a cougar known as P45, the King of Malibu. He is known to have killed – personally killed – something like 45 – excuse me, 60 domestic animals in the last year, all of them somebody's dear pets that were moved into the property and are perfectly legal. They're people's hobby pets and they were dear to them, but they were simply killed. And cougars do not – frequently do not even eat what they kill. They simply kill like cats for the fun of it. Now according to the National Park Service of that area, the requirement, the property requirement for a single – for one or two adult males and a few females and their young –

(Timer rings.)

Ms. Rose: – is 240 square miles to give them a normal range.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Time's up.

Ms. Rose: Okay. So you can see the problem.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Diana Rollo, followed by Peggy Leopold.

Peggy Leopold: I'd like to yield my time.

Chair Raschko: You're Diana Rollo?

Ms. Leopold: Peggy Leopold.

Chair Raschko: Oh, Peggy. Okay. So that would make Mark Leopold next.

Mark Leopold: I'm going to yield my time ___.

Chair Raschko: Okay. And that would make Roger Robinson next. Okay.

Diana Rollo: Diana Rollo, Madrona Drive, Anacortes.

Roger Pierce: Roger Pierce, 3692 Biz Point Road, Anacortes. We're neighbors. It's a collaborative effort here. I was born in Mount Vernon in 1940. Need I say more? We're going to show some examples. These are examples of commercial use that's not appropriate on South Fidalgo Island, but they *are* allowed under the Rural Reserve. Realizing you may not permit these activities, but as long as they're on the list you have to go along and deny them. That means you're going to spend assets and resources in denying these applications. So this is graphic pictures of what these things are that you have on the list. That's not too sophisticated but that's what it is.

A digester requires large volume facilities. That's a big footprint and it smells like rotting kitchen waste and open sewer.

Agricultural processing. Large truck traffic. Bottom line, potential of waste contaminating well waters and tidelands.

I think probably what we're talking about for the most part tonight is water.

Animal preserve. This is a facility that went bad. Small facility gone bad. There were bears, lions, wolves, monkeys, tigers, exotic creatures. The County Commissioners said, I had no idea he had this stuff out there. And he died and the pens got opened up and they went wild.

Asphalt/concrete batching plant. Heavy traffic on rural roads.

Manure lagoon. Air and water pollution. Requires a large footprint and, here again, you're dealing with the wastewater in the water. This is an example of how a manure lagoon works. Get that name wrapped around my tongue. And here you have a great potential of leaching water into the groundwater – wastewater into the groundwater.

Seasonal worker housing. Reduces property values and increases costs for law enforcement oversight. We're not against seasonal worker housing, but there is a cost that comes with it.

Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. I have to confess to being a little mixed up with all the people ceding their time. Roger Robinson. Mark Tibbles.

Roger Robinson: My name's Roger Robinson, 964 Rosario Beach. My family's been out at Rosario Beach on Fidalgo for six generations since 1885. I support the P-12 South Fidalgo proposal. P-12 is not intended to interfere with people's property rights, but it *is* intended to protect senior water rights as well as rural character. It is also intended to open the door for discussion as a community as to how we are going to accomplish this for the majority and not just give our senior water rights away to the developers and a few large landowners. It's not secret we've got a population explosion and it's headed to Skagit County. The problem is on South Fidalgo we don't know what our water situation actually is out there.

In addition to protecting our farmlands, it's time that we take a responsible approach to protect South Fidalgo's unique beauty and rural character, as well as our aquifer, before it's too late. Every summer our wells get lower and lower. A number of people actually haul water from the city. We can't just ignore this and hope for the best. We've got to begin the process and that's what P-12 does.

Rural Reserve is zoned for one house per 10 acres, but because our Planning Department is fee-driven the County enacted a CaRD, which is a dodge around the Growth Management Act that can actually double the density on building lots 10 acres or greater. With a CaRD, the developer leaves most of the acreage in open space and supposedly clusters the houses on lots that can be as small as 50 by 100 feet and as large as one acre. And then the developer clusters – when they develop these, or cluster these lots, the code rewards them with a density bonus so they can do it again. So now they have 10 houses on the 50 acres. And each of those 10 houses can have an ADU, so now we have 20 houses on the 50 acres that are having a lot of families draw a lot of water, creating septic problems, runoff problems, traffic noise. They create a necessity for more police and fire services, larger schools, and ultimately higher property taxes for all of us to pay.

Now the County people are going to tell you things like there's no problem or that there's only been three or four CaRDs out there on South Fidalgo or that we're still within the confines of the GMA or the Comp Plan. As far as buildings are concerned, that very well may be correct. But they have no idea how much water we have and, with all these families that want to move in, of what we're going to do about it. And they won't until we have a USGS study done. All the islands around Fidalgo have been designated sole source aquifers because they've done the USGS study to prove it. Fidalgo hasn't and common sense will tell us that Fidalgo Island, being a big rock just like the rest of them, has the same sole, same aquifer situation as our neighboring islands. And the code states that there shall be no density bonuses for CaRD developments in areas designated as a sole source aquifer.

So I'm asking you, as our Planning Commissioners, to please be proactive and help us protect our senior water rights by putting a stop to CaRD loophole on South Fidalgo at least until the County has a completed USGS hydrogeology study, which will tell us what our water situation is. Thanks.

(Timer rings.)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Mark Tibbles, and then Alison Miller.

Alison Miller: I don't need to speak.

Mark Tibbles: Hi, I'm Mark Tibbles. I live on 13684 Tibbles Lane. My folks moved to Anacortes with the family in 1956 so I've been there for a little while. When they moved there, they bought 75 acres with the plan that as they grew older and retired and needed more money they could sell off some land to do that. Well, before Dad retired, why, the County changed things and they were then unable to sell off small portions of land. So that kind of fouled their retirement plans.

I am against changing the CaRD. I feel that that was already restrictive enough. We are – it's supposed to be growth *management*, not growth *denial*. As far as the water, where I am my well is 276 feet deep. I have a hundred feet of water in it and it produces 30 gallons a minutes. I'm not sure why I should be under the same rules as where they may only be getting two gallons a minute.

So that's it. I'm against it.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Okay, Ms. Miller, you wanted to –

Ms. Miller: Yes, I do.

Chair Raschko: So it'd make Bret Lunsford next, and that would be followed by Jan Robinson.

Bret Lunsford: Hello. My name is Bret Lunsford. I live at 11493 O Avenue, speaking on P-12, South Fidalgo Rural Residential. I am a Rural Reserve property owner on Fidalgo Island. I support the Skagit County Planning and Development Services Department's recommendations on the new South Fidalgo Rural Residential zone. In particular I support the continuation of CaRD, recommended as follows – this is in quote: "The Department recommends against eliminating CaRDS in the SF-RR zone on the basis that the clustering and open space provisions of CaRDS are valuable tools to encourage more efficient land development and the preservation of larger areas of open space. The CaRD ordinance could be improved but it should not be eliminated."

To clarify, the Department's recommendation is to retain CaRDs and also a recommendation to retain the CaRD density bonus. I applaud many of the stated goals of the people involved in the Save South Fidalgo group. But some of the environmentally positive aspects of CaRD are being overlooked. And these are in quotes from the CaRD: "retains larger expanses of property available for agriculture, forestry," and "recreation"; "continuity of open space or ecological functions characteristic of the property"; and "has greater design requirements."

In conclusion, I thank all of the people who have worked on improving zoning on South Fidalgo and I believe that the Skagit County Planning and Development Services Department's recommendations are the best application of the conservation and rural preservation goals motivating all concerned. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Jan Robinson, followed by Liz McNett Crowl.

Jan Robinson: Hi. I'm Jan Heald Robinson and I live at 924 – excuse me, it's Rosario Crest Lane and that is on South Fidalgo. My husband's family's been on Fidalgo Island since 1885. I support the entire P-12 South Fidalgo proposal.

I want to talk about a South Fidalgo density forecast of potential full development of all legally permissible lots. In order to quantify the impact of full development, I used the methodology of a report referred to tonight of "South Fidalgo Stormwater Management Plan, prepared by TetraTech Engineering for Skagit County in 2010. The methodology presents a more complete picture than the calculation provided by Planning Department last week. We had requested a list of existing and potential parcels in Rural Intermediate and Rural Reserve from Planning but never received it. In the absence of that, I've used data which is derived from a combination of Planning's report, the TetraTech report, and Skagit's iMap. If Planning can pull a complete data as requested, a full development picture can be refined. The projection here is an estimate, not a final analysis, and I've included charts with my written testimony for your reference.

When South Fidalgo is fully developed, there's a major increase in the density and a negative impact on the rural character of the area. Planning tells us that in Rural Reserve there will be 130 new residences from property divisions on lots 10 acres and greater. The report does not include those lots which are less than minimum size parcels, which adds another 262 potential new homes. When we get those, plus the existing parcels that are already developed – a house on it, a residence – we're at 780 residences in Rural Reserve. To this number, add in Planning's estimate of a density bonus of 230 residences. Also, homes in Rural Reserve could have an ADU, raising the full development count to over 2000 from an initial 400, well over five times the current density. So think about that: four times, five times.

On South Fidalgo, the three rural zones – Rural Intermediate, Rural Reserve, and Rural Resource – are mutually dependent for rural character and the essential infrastructure. Rural Intermediate has the potential for another 790 new residences under current codes. No density bonuses are allowed but they can add ADUs for each one of those. A fully built-out Rural Intermediate could have well over 4000 homes from a start of 1300, so three times the current density. Do we have an accurate projection of full development? Do we know that we have the water to support this growth? Just as they contracted for the Stormwater Management Plan in 2010, the County needs to fund a USGS hydrogeologic study for South Fidalgo. Without an assessment of the current water supply, the County cannot protect our sole source aquifer and rural character of South –

(Timer rings.)

Ms. Robinson: – Fidalgo today, as required by the Comprehensive Plan, let alone a full development tomorrow. This study must be completed –

Chair Raschko: Your time's up.

Ms. Robinson: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: I'm sorry. Thank you. Liz McNett Crowl, followed by Bill Redding.

Liz McNett Crowl: Liz McNett Crowl, 13797 Trumpeter Lane, Mount Vernon, Washington. I am here tonight to speak about C-2. This is a request that the Planning Commission follow the

Planning Department recommendation on page 9 of the February 28th, 2017, memorandum to the Planning Commission re the 2017 docket of Comp Plan policy, code, and map amendments, which states that the study description be modified to state “unused County right-of-way through agriculture – excuse me – states that the study description be modified to state “unused County right-of-way through agricultural land between Burlington and Bayview Ridge should not be considered as a potential route for US Bike Route 10” – or USBR 10 – “on its own; however, if a road is constructed there, consideration should also be given to providing safe access for bicycles and pedestrians along this route.”

To me Commissioner Wesen’s request is shortsighted. He calls out concern that a nonmotorized transportation facility would take ag land out of production and create conflicts between non-motorized facility users and agricultural activities. This right-of-way is an old state highway right-of-way. That a transportation facility of any kind could occur on this right-of-way is not new. The impacts of a road would have even greater impacts and conflicts on agricultural lands and activities. Roadways, being typically much wider than a standalone, non-motorized facility, would allow greater access of the general public to adjacent farmlands and increased conflicts with agricultural activities.

Skagit County’s rural nature means that all roads are non-motorized facilities. Bicyclists and pedestrians need to have safe facilities to be able to travel between our urban areas and our non-urban areas. It’s important to consider and develop a complete transportation system that meets the needs of all of our residents, as well as visitors and tourists. Not everybody drives or chooses to drive a motorized vehicle and we need to consider those needs as we plan and develop and implement a comprehensive transportation plan that meets the needs of Skagit County today and in the future. I also think that the purpose of a corridor study is to consider *all* options and to identify the ones that are preferred, and that by precluding a non-motorized transportation facility we’re not doing that. So please follow the recommendation of the Planning Department. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Bill Redding, followed by Gary Clyde.

Bill Redding: Good evening. My name’s Bill Redding. We have property on South Fidalgo, 15 acres that we purchased about seven years ago. We spent seven years prior to that looking for property until our kids were threatening to leave home if we had to go look at property again. But it was a long process and part of our parameters were the ability to retire there and to have our kids live on the property also to take care of us when we got too old to do that ourselves.

So this plan was implemented. We purchased the property. We are environmentalists by nature. We have spent three years studying the property after we purchased it to see what it needed or how it should be treated, and developed a plan from there and have now been trying to implement that prior to building. This P-12 would, of course, exclude us from doing that or having our kids on our property, so I am against it.

I do, however, sympathize with some of the other points of the proposal in usage and I understand the water. We do have – are fortunate to have PUD water at that property but it seems a – I know a study has not been done but the sole source aquifer is a consideration, I believe. But, on the other hand, the other point I think is important for us to consider is, When does a group of people have the right to take away another person’s rights just because they’re a majority? Some of the most heinous and horrible things in this – that has happened in our world were because of that

very thing when principles weren't followed. In other words, constitutional principles, et cetera. People have rights. We purchased that property knowing the CaRD was available. We would not have purchased that property if the CaRD was not available. It's agricultural property. It's the epitome of rural property. We intend to keep it that way. But we would like to exercise our right as purchased to develop the property with another residence for our – one of our children. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Gary Clyde, followed by Carol Ehlers.

Gary Clyde: Gary Clyde – I pass.

Chair Raschko: Oh, he's passed? Okay, thank you. Carol Ehlers?

Carol Ehlers: Just a minute.

Chair Raschko: And after Carol will be – I apologize if I get it wrong. I think it's Duncan Eades.

Duncan Eades: I'll pass.

Chair Raschko: He'll pass? So after Carol will be Brian Wetcher.

Ms. Ehlers: Carol Ehlers, Windcrest Lane. My parents bought in 1963 and when I inherited I chose to retire. But I have watched what happened with the island. I've watched what happened with the laws and with the Growth Management Act. And one of the things which this County refuses to do is collect the information that exists about Fidalgo Island and put it together in a portfolio so that everyone can see what there is. There *is* a map of the waterlines but it's never been used in any process and I know about the processes because I've been on the Planning Commission for 25 years. The islands used to have a plan. When Growth Management came in we couldn't have it. We had to be regulated entirely according to the floodplain. Now there's some virtue in that but we're not a floodplain.

So I'm going to contribute some maps to this discussion. This is a map you will see in most of the published documents about Skagit County. It gives you a good idea of the relationship of the forests and the parks and the city and the roads and the main roads and the kind of evidence that gives the feeling of a rural island, especially if you go on the top of Mount Erie and look around. And that, I think, from listening to all the hearings in all this county and the entire planning process, that's what people want to retain. But it's never been described very well. So this is the first thing to look at.

The second thing is if what you were given in the handout doesn't make it clear: If you have white is city and blue is city then is this city? And it is. So I went to Anacortes today and got from them a map of their zoning so that it's clear that this whole area and along the coast all the way in, plus this, is the urban growth area. That's where the industrial and commercial was. Now back in the 1890s it was decided throughout most of the European American world that you separated residential from industrial and commercial. The state of Washington got there in 1990, and under the Growth Management Act commercial-industrial belongs in the city because they have plenty of water; they have good fire departments; and they have the required sewer. And those are the things you need for a viable institution I bet most people are talking about. So this is the map. This

is where it was agreed in 1990 that the industrial would go. If you look at the zoning map of South Fidalgo, there are a lot of places like Tibble's and the market at the fire hall –

(Timer rings.)

Ms. Ehlers: – that are there but they were there.

Chair Raschko: I'm sorry, Carol, time's up.

Ms. Ehlers: Well, if you want to ignore fire hazard, which is what everybody does... This is the rain map for Fidalgo Island.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Ms. Ehlers: Twenty inches. This is the fire hazard.

Chair Raschko: I think, Carol, in fairness to everybody else –

Ms. Ehlers: I realize that.

Chair Raschko: – I have to ask you to please stop.

Ms. Ehlers: But, you see, you have never been told about the Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan. You've never been told about the extreme fire hazard on Fidalgo.

Chair Raschko: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Patty Wasson, please, and then Bob Shelly.

Ms. Ehlers: Go look on the natural hazard mitigation document. You'll see why CaRDs have a hazard.

Chair Raschko: Bob Shelly?

Bob Shelly: We didn't realize – we thought we were just signing in.

Chair Raschko: Oh, you're just signing in – okay! Bruce Wick?

Brian Wetcher: Brian Wetcher?

Chair Raschko: Pardon me?

Mr. Wetcher: Brian Wetcher?

Ms. Lohman: Oh, he was next. Right. Brian Wetcher.

Chair Raschko: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. Brian. And then after that would be Bruce Wick.

Mr. Wetcher: I'm Brian Wetcher, 814 26th Street in Anacortes, and Carol Ehlers is always a hard act to follow but I'll try. I'm a longtime member of the Anacortes Community Forestlands Advisory

Board. As a matter of fact, this must be important because I see the only other longest seated member of that board in the room tonight.

We would – I would individually support the changes that are proposed for South Fidalgo, and I believe it would be really good for the County to once again engage in the planning process for a South Fidalgo Bay plan. You've got all the groundwork done for you years ago and you should step forward and take advantage of the community. I think in the long term, just like the comprehensive land use plan for the city forestlands over the years has evolved and changed with both the science and the density with the UGA boundaries on our borders, things do need to change when circumstances change. I believe that the County is making a good step forward with this. And as you progress forward with development on South Fidalgo, I think you will be able to accommodate those interests and those concerns which the CaRD process was originally designed to satisfy. Although it has many good goals, it has never been properly functional and has engaged in both County and City litigation with property owners. So I would hope that we would progress forward with this and make accommodations for those people that need those accommodations, which I'm sure the County can do under a proper planning process. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Let's see now. Bob Shelly did not wish to speak?

Mr. Shelly: Correct.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So Bruce Wick, followed by Tom Glade. Bruce Wick? Or am I reading the handwriting wrong? What's that look like?

Kathy Mitchell: Oh, jeez.

Chair Raschko: Is there a Bruce?

Ms. Mitchell: It's either a "W" or an "M" or something in between. Possibly Black.

Chair Raschko: It could be Black. Is there a Tom Glade in the room? Okay. Rick Solberg will be next.

Tom Glade: Good evening. My name is Tom Glade. I am President of Evergreen Islands and I am here to represent all our members. I reside at 210 Mansfield Court in Anacortes. My partner owns 10 acres above Turner's Bay in South Fidalgo.

So Evergreen Islands strongly supports this Comprehensive Plan amendment, P-12, which will create a South Fidalgo Rural Residential area. And when we appealed the clear-cut of Mount Erie we prevailed on the term of the aesthetic thing on the properties of the environment. And so aesthetic means pertaining to a sense of beauty, and also having a sense of beautiful, characterized by a love of beauty. And the reason why this was important is because over the history of South Fidalgo all the residents have made huge efforts to preserve the natural beauty of the island. And so during those years, the residents rejected large tracts at Fidalgo Island and these parks include Washington Park with 220 acres, Deception Pass Park with 4000 acres, the ACFL with 2800 acres, Skagit County Sharpe's Park/Montgomery-Duban Headlands 110 acres, and Washington Park with 220 acres. So this shows where they are so that they're spread out with these things that are in this pastel green color, which are Open Space of Regional Statewide Importance. So that you can see it is quite a bit of coverage in South Fidalgo. And this is just to

give you an idea of what the topography is. It's very rural and very – it's nonfarming, mountainous kind of terrain. And so if we go on, this is a view of Mount Erie and this is another view of around Campbell Lake and South Campbell Lake – from South Campbell Lake Road to Campbell Lake Road. And this is a view from Mount Erie looking south. And this is a view from Mount Erie again looking – this is southeast, is what it should say. And then this is Turner's Bay where my partner's property is, and Evergreen Islands appealed a – let's see – the Summit Trails Equestrian Park, and it was based on this land right here which is just above Turner's Bay. And it was a 5000-foot clubhouse, 16,000-foot indoor riding arena, stalls for 100 horses, two 10-foot wide horse trails, 150 individual RV sites, three group RV sites, a group camp site –

(Timer rings.)

Mr. Glade: – camp site, full-service comfort stations, and a sewage dump station. So are we done? Am I done?

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Mr. Glade: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Rick Solberg and then David Wallace. So, Mr. Glade? Is it possible to leave copies of your pictures?

Mr. Glade: I will, but I'll also be submitting another time.

Chair Raschko: All right. Thank you. Okay, Rick Solberg, and David Wallace, and then Larry Stevens.

Rick Solberg: Pass.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Mr. Solberg: I thought I was signing in.

Chair Raschko: All right, and then Julia Hurd.

David Wallace: Hello. My name is David Wallace. I live at 13025 Thompson Road. Originally I was asked to deliver a page by neighbor Steve Kuchin. It says "We, residents of Thompson Road, strongly oppose the proposed zoning change of our land from its current Rural Reserve to the proposed 'South Fidalgo Rural Reserve' and its attendant excessive use restrictions. If any change were welcomed by us, it would be to go back to the former Rural Intermediate classification." This was signed by Steve Kuchin, Tammy Gilden, and the Larsens – Mrs. Gilden's parents – myself, and my wife, and a few others. They are all of our adjacent neighbors. My property sits in between an excavation company on my north property boundary. It sits 100 feet from a canine training facility and boarding facility. Across the street Mr. Kuchin has a salmon processing license or business he's not currently using, but he, you know, made sure I mention it when... And then just to the north of him lies Fidalgo Taxidermy, Mrs. Gilden's and Garth.

In our area I don't see that the South Fidalgo Rural Reserve area fits. We have many businesses that aren't going to be okay down around Campbell Lake or Erie. We can see the lights from the

refineries. We have electrical substation there. We have another kennel within a mile or half-mile; two breweries; a golf course. So where we sit it's not really applicable as it may be on the southern end of the actual island towards Campbell Lake and towards Lake Erie, where I can certainly see some value to that. But where we sit we're literally less than a quarter mile from a water processing plant that was being proposed and fell through. So just off of – just south of the, you know, the Highway 20 corridor there. I just don't believe it fits where we are. If this was to go in place, I would be the only property without the same rights as everyone adjacent to me. That is –

(Timer rings.)

Mr. Wallace: – directly taking away from my property rights. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Sir, do you have anything that you want to submit ____? Thank you. Julia Hurd, followed by Mike Kurtz. Is Julia? Okay.

Julia Hurd: Julia Hurd. I live in Alger, 19396 Ash Lane, Burlington. I didn't realize I signed up to speak. I thought I was just signing in, but as long as I – my name got called I'd just like to say that I support the Rural Residential change, but especially because of the aquifer issue. So I really think it should be studied. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Mike Kurtz and then Jim McClans. McClaw? So is Mike Kurtz still here?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, Jim McClaw, it looks like, from South Fidalgo.

Ms. Mitchell: How about McLean?

Chair Raschko: Well, it looks like McLean. Jim McLean.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Robert Adler.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Ruth Bach. Bachruch.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: How about Thomas Conroy? And next would be Keith Bracht.

Thomas Conroy: Hi, my name is Thomas Conroy, C-o-n-r-o-y, 4307 Ginnett Road and I want to first thank you for your personal time that you've dedicated to listen to all this testimony. I'd like to speak in favor of the South Fidalgo amendment and also for the need of a study, a hydrological study. I also want to – you know, I'm very thankful to be a citizen of this county, especially after reading last week's *Skagit Valley Herald* and learning of the support that our law enforcement has

and refusal to bend to or dismantle our community at the whims of the federal – the political will of the federal government.

Skagit County islands, including Fidalgo, needs the hydrological study to get the best available information. It's hard to make decisions without that information, scientific information. Our state has benefitted, our fisheries have benefitted over the years – recent years – since we first learned that there was an environment. I mean, I can remember Rachel Carson's, you know, book and the effect it had, and people kind of turned their noses up. But look how far we've come and what a difference it's made in our community, our state. Our forestry practices have changed. And anytime we have the opportunity to learn more about, you know, our environment and the community that we live in, there has to be self-sacrifices for the all. We cannot just focus on self. And I hope that this Planning Commission takes that into consideration, you know, when they make their decisions. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Keith Bracht.

Keith Bracht: Pass.

Chair Raschko: Barbara Bracht?

Mr. Bracht: She signed us up thinking it was just a sign-in sheet.

Chair Raschko: Okay!

Mr. Bracht: Like the time she signed me up for three years of *Bridal* magazine.

(laughter)

Chair Raschko: Well, I hope you enjoyed it! Howard Gulley, followed by John Bame. I hope I got the names right.

Howard Gulley: Good evening. I'm Howard Gully, 13574 Tibbles Lane. I'm a new guy here. I came in '68. The state Growth Management law is intended to do just as it says: manage the growth, not stop it. Thus the proposal could be defeated in court if you have enough money, lawyers, and years. When I say "money" I mean a wheelbarrow full of it. That's a terrible way to solve anything. When you impede growth in a desired area while the country is still growing, property values will rise greater than the surrounding area. Based on how tax structures work, a greater tax burden is then shifted to the more high valued area. A good example of this is Bainbridge and Vashon Island. Then this results in the area's children not being able to afford to return to their roots, based on affordability. Multi-generational families then are separated not only by affordability but also by job availability that is also restricted.

When the two previous situations are in place for any length of time, the overall area begins to deteriorate, mostly at the lower economic end due to lack of economic infusion of construction and remodeling capital, and the area starts a downhill trend. The division between rich and poor increases significantly.

The 10-acre rule, while it has some value as far as wells go, is nonsensical as far as land use goes. I have three acres and have fattened up two steers on two acres. Had to buy hay, of course, in the wintertime and do some grain feeding, but they were big steers when it was time to fill a number of freezers. The water issue is a valid area to the point that that is the only option. The well right next door to me, about 50 yards away, hasn't fluctuated more than two or three inches in 35 years. I personally get my water from the Anacortes water line that runs down there. It's an 18-inch line. And the City of Anacortes serves a tremendous area for the Whidbey Island Naval Air Station, the refineries, and the entire area, and they're only using 40% of their allocated capacity.

So this means that a one-area rule that everything fits doesn't apply. There's a lot of other options that go into this and this should be part of, then, the planning process for individual sites. Yeah, and, of course, to end –

(Timer rings.)

Mr. Gulley: – this up ____, of course, I must admit that I'm extremely prejudiced in this regard here in that I'd like to have all of my women come back, all 11 of them.

Chair Raschko: Okay, I'm sorry I have to –

Mr. Gulley: One wife, three daughters, and seven granddaughters.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Gulley.

(laughter)

Chair Raschko: Okay, John – it's either Bame or Barne.

John Bame: (unintelligible)

Chair Raschko: You pass? You sure? You're the last on the list. All right. Is there anybody that did not sign up that wishes they had? Yes, sir?

Harold Harrington: I failed to sign up. My name's Harold Harrington. I'm on 4579 Ginnett Road in South Fidalgo. And I just want to talk about water for a few minutes. It's been hit a number of times by various people with good information. It's an underlying issue. It's not that you can build something and put wells down and get all your grandchildren there in little tiny CaRDs if they don't have any water to drink. And we have no idea what water resources are available on this island. Being an island, there's a pretty fair chance it's an isolated aquifer. And if you look at that topology map that was up there, it's an excellent example. I personally believe there's at least a few different what you would call aquifers on the island. Now I'm on Ginnett Road. I have a well that's 650 feet deep. I hydrofracked it and I got some water. There was nothing in that 650 feet but solid rock. There were no layers, there was no sand, there was no aquifer. I'm getting it from cracks in the rock. The same is true in a large area down there to the south of me. If I had bought a property a quarter-mile up the road, I would have water coming out my ears with a 20- or 30-foot well. Across the street from me, which is part of a larger water flow system there, they had an artesian well. In the same time, there are other people on the island whose wells are going dry. Just

because *you* want more water because you want your property rights protected doesn't mean that you can take the rights for water away from the people you're draining the water from. It's not a one or the other. And the County absolutely needs to get in here and figure out what's under the ground here so we know what we can use. The County is assigning people if they can drill a hole and it gets damp in the bottom they can build, and that's not the way to do it when you're in a limited aquifer. It's going to run out. We're going to get saltwater inversion. Guemes is the poster child for this and we're in the same basic condition. Their rock; our rock. Their rock has a layer on top; our rock has a layer on top. And it just has to be done. And one of the things we can try doing, you know, with the community is start monitoring some of the wells on the island. For under 500 bucks, probably closer to two- or three-hundred, you can get a device that sits on top of your wellhead. It will measure the depth of your water sitting in the well within a fraction of an inch, if you want it. Continuously monitor – it records it, you can come along and pick it up and we can at least – if somebody was willing to do that kind of thing and the County could maybe come up with a few funds –

(Timer rings.)

Mr. Harrington: – we could get an idea where it's getting dry. That's it. ____ water.

Chair Raschko: There was one more gentleman wishing to speak.

Larry Becker: Thank you. I also didn't sign. I own roughly 50 acres –

Ms. Mitchell: Your name, please.

Mr. Becker: Larry Becker, 1495 Rosario.

Ms. Lohman: Can you repeat your last name?

Mr. Becker: Becker, and I own roughly 50 acres on South Fidalgo. We've had it since roughly 1983. Originally we had planned to retire to this property and including building an airstrip. And I would – after listening to people talking this evening, one of the conclusions I would come to – and I'd encourage you to think about – is that we probably need to examine how people are using their land in this area. For example, with an airstrip it keeps the land in an open space. I've had our property there for an open space since 1983. I have another airstrip at 9586 Padilla Heights which I've had also for roughly the same period of time, and I've kept that land in open space and it's not impacting the rural nature of where we are now and I can't see it impacting the rural nature of this area where we're describing. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you very much. Everybody's had their opportunity?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, with that then, we'll conclude the public hearing part of this meeting. I appreciate everybody's thoughtful input, and thank you for your patience and for coming tonight. We will now move on to a Department Update. Dale?

People are welcome to stay for the remainder of the meeting. We're going to take a threeminute recess while people depart.

(break)

Mr. Pernula: ...early since we're short a long range planner and we're going to have to do it in whatever time we can put together. So we'll try to get it to you next week, but if not the next meeting may be delayed a little bit. We have eight openings in our department right now and we're trying to fill those. Five are due to retirements. It's just kind of something that's occurring these days. And once we get through this we're going to go back to some of the other projects, including, of course, the Rural Forestry Initiative and eventually the Shoreline Master Program. So we've got a lot of work in front of us and those'll be coming back to you in the future. Yes?

Hollie Del Vecchio: Dale, is it okay to make an information request right now since I will forget maybe tomorrow?

Mr. Pernula: Sure.

Ms. Del Vecchio: With regard to the Guemes P-7, I would just – I would love some more information on kind of long term management of those conservation easements. It doesn't have to be in great detail, just broad strokes of how we think those will be maintained over time.

Mr. Pernula: Are you talking about *with* the changes or how they've been done in the past?

Ms. Del Vecchio: No, with the changes. So if we are going to be – there's going to be a requirement for conservation easements just _____, whose – is there funding to be enforcing, maintaining, managing these permanent conservation easements over the – for the long haul?

Mr. Pernula: We'll put something together.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Lohman: And you're going to give that to all of us?

Mr. Pernula: Sure. We'll send it to everybody.

Ms. Del Vecchio: No, just me!

Mr. Walters: We'll put it in the staff report.

Chair Raschko: Any other questions for the staff?

Ms. Mitchell: I do have a question. When this was proposed, was there a reason that it was – for instance, like for this South Fidalgo thing. I understand how the Guemes was done. For the whole South Island for the big changes, why was – why were the parts chosen the way they were chosen? I'd like any information you have on that.

Mr. Pernula: For South Fidalgo?

Ms. Mitchell: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Pernula: Why were the specific – like exclusions on the land use and the change of density and so on?

Ms. Mitchell: Yes, that. So why the zoning changes chosen where they were chosen specifically –

Mr. Walters: You mean the geographic area?

Ms. Mitchell: Yeah, that plus what you just said. Both those pieces are important.

Mr. Pernula: We can probably put something together. It may not be very intricate. We'd probably have to talk to some of those people. I would assume because it's the Rural Reserve that is the issue that they want to deal with and those are mapped already.

Ms. Mitchell: Okay.

Mr. Pernula: That's the area with the density bonus and so on.

Ms. Mitchell: Okay.

Mr. Pernula: But we'll put something together. We'll talk to them.

Ms. Ehlers: I can give you the answer later.

Chair Raschko: Okay, anything else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Walters: If you think of other questions, you should e-mail them. We'll include them in the staff report. Probably we'll have a little bit of time.

Tammy Candler: Can I say something?

Chair Raschko: Go ahead.

Ms. Candler: I think I have the same question as Kathy's asking but I want to ask it a little bit differently. We heard a lot of stuff tonight about maybe how there's a separation of north and south – for lack of a better way to say it – uses on the island. Is there – has there been discussion in the Department about not having them treated the same?

Mr. Walters: I think we've definitely identified some differences in the different areas. The proposal was for the whole area but we might recommend some changes to the geographic boundary.

Mr. Pernula: Are you talking about the Thompson Road area being different from –

Ms. Candler: One of them, but there were some other people more further out, I think, also.

Ms. Mitchell: What, like north of Campbell Lake?

Ms. Candler: Yeah.

Ms. Mitchell: Yeah.

Ms. Candler: North of Camp – Tibbles Lane. Some of the people spoke to that. Highway 20, closer to Highway 20. Well, Highway 20 north but, yeah.

Mr. Pernula: Okay. We'll see what we can put together.

Ms. Lohman: Well, and – Mr. Chair, may I?

Chair Raschko: Yeah.

Ms. Lohman: There was quite a bit of reference to some people that had PUD water or Anacortes water, and so maybe some information on who's on water and who isn't.

Mr. Walters: We actually have some maps of that. These aren't our maps. They're from Anacortes and PUD. But we're planning to get some higher quality ones and make them available.

Chair Raschko: That'd be really helpful. Thank you.

Ms. Mitchell: And I don't know about the rest – the kids, but when I asked for maps for ready for tonight there were a couple that Kirk generated on the 28th for how the Rural Reserve – what the potential was for the CaRDs.

Mr. Pernula: Those two maps they had?

Ms. Mitchell: Yeah. Inadvertently we didn't get the second one printed and I'd like to make sure everybody has a hard copy of that.

Mr. Pernula: Okay.

Ms. Mitchell: Thank you.

Mr. Pernula: I have a copy right now if you need it.

Chair Raschko: Anything else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. We'll turn now to Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements. We can start at this end. Nothing?

Josh Axthelm: No.

Ms. Candler: Nothing.

Chair Raschko: I'd just like to say I thought it was really interesting testimony tonight and really helpful, and actually I got a lot of insights that I might not have thought about myself. So I really appreciate the process. Anybody else?

Ms. Mitchell: I concur.

Kathi Jett: I agree.

Martha Rose: Same for me. The comments were really helpful.

Ms. Del Vecchio: You know, everybody's gone now. Most everybody. Yes, it was helpful to have people show up and share their thoughts and opinions, so thank you.

Ms. Mitchell: One more thing for anybody that's left and anybody that's still listening at home. Dale, could you repeat what the last minute is that somebody could hand more information in to be considered?

Mr. Pernula: Okay. Thursday afternoon at 4:30 p.m. That's when the public comment – written portion of the public comments closes. And I think we have a – we have a slide that covers that.

Mr. Walters: That will appear as an overlay on the video.

Ms. Mitchell: Super, because there were a number of people that were asking right towards the end. And some folks are not used to doing this and so if they're still listening it has to be either handed in and stamped that way or in e-mail e-mailed a certain way to the County that they're referring to by that certain time.

Mr. Pernula: Yep.

Mr. Walters: And we are now getting pretty good uptake on the rule that you have to tell us what you're commenting about. Comments that are coming in are well-labeled.

Ms. Candler: And it was helpful tonight, too.

Chair Raschko: Okay, is there anything else for the good of the Commission?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: I'd entertain a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Lohman: I move.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Second.

Chair Raschko: All in favor?

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: We're adjourned. Thank you (gavel).