

**Skagit County Planning Commission  
Deliberations: 2025-2030 CFP  
Deliberations: 2024 Docket  
November 19, 2024**

**Planning**

**Commissioners:** Kathy Mitchell, District 1 (absent)  
Vince Henley, District 1  
Angela Day, District 1  
Amy Hughes, District 2  
Tim Raschko, Chair, District 2  
Joe Woodmansee, District 2  
Tammy Candler, Vice Chair, District 3  
Jen Hutchison, District 3  
Kiera Wright, District 3 (absent)

**Staff:** Robby Eckroth, Senior Planner

Chair Tim Raschko: (gavel) Good evening, everybody. The November 19, 2024, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission is now in session. I believe Commissioner Mitchell is our only absence. Okay. So I'd welcome a motion to approve the October 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting minutes.

Commissioner Vince Henley: I so move.

Commissioner Jen Hutchison: I'll second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to approve the minutes of October 22<sup>nd</sup>. Is there any discussion of those minutes?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: No corrections? Okay, all in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: So those are approved. Now we have the October 29 minutes. Is there a motion to approve?

Commissioner Henley: I also move that we approve those.

Commissioner Angela Day: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to approve the October 29 minutes. Is there any discussion of those?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, all those in favor, then, of approving the minutes, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: So the minutes are approved. We have a provision in the agenda for Public Remarks. Is there anybody online who wishes to speak?

Robby Eckroth: We have one member from the public. If you would like to speak, please unmute or raise your hand and go ahead and speak. Give it just a few seconds, just in case.

(silence)

Mr. Eckroth: It does not appear to be unmuting.

Chair Raschko: All right, so there'll be no Public Remarks, which brings us to one of our main objectives tonight, Deliberations on the 2025 – 2030 Annual Capital Facilities Plan Update. So Mr. Eckroth, please.

Mr. Eckroth: Thank you, Commissioners. I'll keep it brief. Tara Satushek's the project manager for this but she wasn't able to make it tonight. My name is Robby Eckroth. I'm a Senior Planner here at Skagit County Planning and Development Services, just for the record. So the public comment period for the Capital Facilities Plan ended on October 31<sup>st</sup>. We received no public comments and no testimony. There has been no changes on the Capital Facilities Plan amendment since you last saw it. Tara prepared a Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action that are based on what you all approved last year, with the exception of some date changes. So that is all staff has for a follow-up and I'm available for any questions. I'll do my best to answer them.

Chair Raschko: Are there any questions for staff?

Vice Chair Tammy Candler: I just want to ask if you would scroll down and let us take a look at this. Thank you.

Commissioner Day: Hi, Robby. Thank you for your presentation and for all the work that went into this. I have a question. I read about this also includes changes in the Transportation Improvement Program or our compliance with that. Can you tell us – I've reviewed the memo and all the amendments – can you tell us how those two things fit together?

Mr. Eckroth: Yeah, so the Transportation Improvement Plan is adopted by reference into the Capital Facilities Plan. It has a separate public hearing that actually goes before the Board of County Commissioners as well, and they usually are adopted simultaneously.

Commissioner Day: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Eckroth: Yeah.

Chair Raschko: Anybody else?

(silence)

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah. It looks good.

Chair Raschko: All right. I guess there's no more questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. So we'll go into Deliberations. Is there anybody who wishes to make a motion? Commissioner Day?

Commissioner Day: Thank you. I move that we recommend that the Board of County Commissioners adopt the Capital Facilities Plan as amended.

Vice Chair Candler: I second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to recommend adoption of the Capital Facilities Plan. Is there any discussion of that motion?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All right. All those in favor of the motion, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: All opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Any abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: So I presume that we need to do Findings of Fact on this.

Vice Chair Candler: I don't think it's in our packet but it's on the screen here.

Mr. Eckroth: I apologize for that. I –

Vice Chair Candler: That's okay. That's okay. It's on the screen.

Chair Raschko: It's on the screen. So why don't we quickly peruse the Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action? I think what might be expeditions is to just come to – what's the word I'm looking for?

Vice Chair Candler: Can I make a – consensus?

Chair Raschko: Consensus – on each one? Okay. So everybody's had an opportunity to look at Number 1?

Commissioner Day: So we make a motion?

Chair Raschko: Well, we can make a motion on the whole thing after we kind of –

Commissioner Day: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Is there any problem with Number 1?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, Number 2? That looks very simple. Number 3?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. I doubt there's anything on Number 3 or 4.

Mr. Eckroth: Five?

Chair Raschko: Five.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: These are just basically stating facts. Let's go to 6.

Mr. Eckroth: Yeah.

Chair Raschko: Is everybody up to 9 yet?

(laughter)

Vice Chair Candler: Yes.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Anybody have a problem with 10?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Eleven?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Twelve?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Do we have anything beyond 12? Okay, so I presume we have consensus that we're all in agreement with the Findings of Fact? So all those in favor of approving the Findings of Fact –

Vice Chair Candler: Aye.

Chair Raschko: – please say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Any abstentions?

Commissioner Hutchison: My last name. Only has an “n” on the end of it. Thank you.

Mr. Eckroth: Mm-hmm.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So we’re finished then with the Annual Capital Facilities Plan Update. And we’ll go to Deliberations on the 2024 Annual Comprehensive Plan Map and Development Code Amendments Docket. Mr. Eckroth, please.

Mr. Eckroth: Thank you, Chair. I’ve got a brief presentation. \_\_\_\_\_ mostly to know where we’re at in the process. So today we are here to hold deliberations on the 2024 Docket of Comprehensive Plan, Development Regulations, and Mapping Amendments. The Planning Commission will be voting on a recommendation on each docket petition to the Board of County Commissioners at this meeting. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment process is an annual process where citizens and County staff can submit petitions to make changes to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations. And as we can see on the screen, we are at the Planning Commission recommendation stage of Step 2. The petitions and supporting documents, including the staff report, which contain more detail on each petition, can be found at the website on the bottom of the screen at [www.skagitcounty.net/2024cpa](http://www.skagitcounty.net/2024cpa).

So following this meeting, the Board of County Commissioners will be holding a work session on December 9<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 p.m. and will be taking possible action on the docket on December 16<sup>th</sup> at 2 p.m.

I’m available to answer any questions prior to deliberations. And thank you, Commissioners.

Chair Raschko: Are there any questions for staff?

Vice Chair Candler: I do have a question. I’m not sure how to formulate it. The comment that is addressed in your staff report – I think that’s what we call this thing – is talking about taxes, and I read that and I found it very interesting as a concept. Is that within the purview of what we’re addressing?

Mr. Eckroth: I don’t believe so. I believe that’s not something that we look at when we’re looking at consistency with Comprehensive Plan from a future land use perspective or anything like that. So that’s completely within the purview of the Assessor’s Office.

Vice Chair Candler: And that would have to come as a code amendment to whatever they’re looking at. This is a completely separate petition, correct?

Mr. Eckroth: I believe so. Yeah.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay. Thank you. That was my only question.

Chair Raschko: Any other questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Thank you. Is there anything else, Tammy? Okay. I'm open for other opinions, but it seems to me that we have room in the documents to approve Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action for each of the amendments separately. So I would recommend that we go through these one-by-one and we vote on each one as we go. Okay? Any other ideas or –

Vice Chair Candler: Good idea.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So why don't we start out with LR24-01, the Deception State Park OSRSI Rezone? The floor's open to discuss LR24-01.

Commissioner Day: Mr. Chair?

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Day?

Commissioner Day: Thank you. I move that we recommend to the County Board of Commissioners that they adopt LR24-01 regarding the Deception Pass Rezone.

Vice Chair Candler: I second.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded to recommend to the Board of Commissioners that they accept the Deception Pass State Park OSRSI Rezone. And so all those in favor, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Did I mess up?

Vice Chair Candler: Well, without discussion I'm not sure what we're going to put in our Findings, but it doesn't matter. We'll cross that bridge when we get there.

Chair Raschko: Did I forget about the discussion part?

(laughter)

Vice Chair Candler: It's okay!

Chair Raschko: Is there any discussion?

Vice Chair Candler: I was just going to hope that the person who moved would introduce it so we'll know what to put in our Findings, but that's –

Commissioner Day: Yeah, I'll speak to the motion.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you.

Commissioner Day: Thank you for bringing that up. I think that it makes sense to do this rezone since it is adjacent to the existing state park, and I think it's a valuable resource for the county to have this park and valued by citizens and visitors. And so it makes sense and I don't see any concerns with it.

Chair Raschko: Anybody else?

Commissioner Hutchison: I agree wholly that it should be the same zoning as the rest of the park adjacent to it. I don't see why it wouldn't, so it just makes sense.

Chair Raschko: Anybody else? Commissioner Day?

Commissioner Day: As far as in response to Commissioner Candler's question, I think there are suggestions for Findings of Fact in the recorded motion that was provided to us as a draft. And I've reviewed those and I think they capture the Commission's thinking – assuming that we approve this – and logic and reasons for action.

Mr. Eckroth: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Anything more?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, with that new information, all those in favor of approving the motion, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Any abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, so it passes. So we have the Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action. Do we need to go through these or do we wish to have a motion to approve?

Mr. Eckroth: Chair, may I ask a question real quick? Reviewing how we did this last year, I believe there was motions made on each of the petitions and then there was a motion made for the entire Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action, which is recorded at the bottom. I'm not sure if you want to do that again that way. I just wanted – that's the way this draft is currently structured so I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so you're recommending that we do the Findings of Fact afterwards for all of it?

Mr. Eckroth: No, not necessarily. So I believe the way you did it last year was you made a motion, you made your recommendation, you went through the Findings of Fact, and then you went to the next petition, did the same thing, and then at the end you voted on the entire document as a whole.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: So we don't need a vote right now. We can move on.

Chair Raschko: That's fine.

Commissioner Kiera Wright: Don't we want to separate, though, the petitions? I'm confused because the document has a chunk out so that each one is separate when I printed.

Mr. Eckroth: Right, so there's a vote on the recommendation itself and then there's a vote on – at the very bottom, which I'll show you – separate from each of the petitions.

Commissioner Wright: So it's individual and then there's one whole big one?

Mr. Eckroth: Right, it's just recommending approval or denial of the entire document, the Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action, for the entire 2024 Docket. Again, we don't have to do it that way. It's just how we did it last year.

Chair Raschko: My thinking is that to look at the Findings of Fact and the Reasons for Action for all of them at the end would be kind of a mash. I mean, it's so easy to address them right after we talked about the main topic, which is what I was starting out to do. So what's everybody's pleasure?

Commissioner Day: Well, I think for one of the proposals there are no Findings of Fact, so I kind of agree with you. If we take the Findings of Fact with each proposal, it might help us stay on track.

Chair Raschko: I think it would be.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay. I would be in agreement with that.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so if that being the case, then we'd vote on the Findings of Fact for LR24-01 at this point. Unless I'm overseeing the fact we already did. Did we?

Vice Chair Candler: No, we haven't yet. Scroll back up to that part.

Mr. Eckroth: Yeah, I'm sorry. I'm just going to have to make some changes to the document here to do that.

Vice Chair Candler: I see. I see what you're saying.

Commissioner Day: I mean, we can vote on them all at once, but I think it would be helpful if we discuss them as –



Mr. Eckroth: Right, which is the way it was done last year. There was discussion right after the vote on the Findings of Fact still, so you're still going one-by-one. \_\_\_ vote on the whole document \_\_\_.

Commissioner Day: Got it. That makes sense.

Chair Raschko: We'll go by consensus then on the Findings of Fact, then vote on them all at the end, right?

Commissioner Day: Yeah.

Chair Raschko: All right? Okay. Sounds like a good way to go.

Vice Chair Candler: So can you scroll to the Findings? Just above where you are.

Mr. Eckroth: Oh, yeah.

Vice Chair Candler: I think the reason that Commissioner Day gave was that it was adjacent to existing parks and valued by visitors. I think the spirit of that is sort of captured here, talking about line adjustments and things. I just wanted to know if you want something specific in here for your reason or if you're happy with these.

Commissioner Day: I think when I read through them I thought they captured it, but I think we *could* add some language in there about the value of having these parks available to citizens and visitors.

Vice Chair Candler: And I think (f) kind of addresses that.

Commissioner Hutchison: Letter (c) notes that it's part of Deception State Park, so...

Vice Chair Candler: So as far as a consensus, I could start. I'm happy with those. I don't know if other people disagree.

Commissioner Day: That works for me.

Chair Raschko: Is everybody all right with it? Okay. We'll move on to LR24-02, the Bayview Ridge Light Industrial Buffer and Landscape Amendment. Is there any discussion or a motion?

Commissioner Amy Hughes: I have discussion.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Commissioner Hughes: I am concerned about this proposal in that we're changing code that was just made 10 years ago that went through an in-depth process. And without a land use plan of how that is being presented, I have problems accepting it.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Commissioner Day: Should we have a motion on the table?

Chair Raschko: We could have a motion. Go ahead, please.

Commissioner Day: I move that we recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that they reject LR24-02 related to Bayview Ridge.

Commissioner Wright: I'll second that.

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's been moved and seconded. Is there discussion on those?

Vice Chair Candler: Yes. I'm really torn on this one so don't think I feel strongly one way or another. But I definitely – my concern, of course, is that if we are not sort of maximizing the use of areas that are zoned for light industry, we're causing problems throughout the county elsewhere. And it is unfortunate because of the recency of the plan and – this stemmed from switching gears through investigation and discussion and deciding that that area is what maybe wasn't best used for the road they were going down for the residential, switching it over to – because of the proximity to the airport and whatever into this Light Industrial. It's caused some issues, and this is certainly one of them. And I have sympathy for all those commenters that we got were almost all opposed. And I understand that. However, I do think it's sort of a consequence of that decision that was made. Within that context, it sort of makes sense to allow – to maximize the use. That's all I have. That's all.

Chair Raschko: Can I ask: What decision is it a consequence of?

Vice Chair Candler: When Bayview Ridge switched from sort of the goal to being a residential area to being the light industry.

Chair Raschko: Other comments?

Commissioner Henley: Well, I think it's okay.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Joe Woodmansee: I share the same concern about limited amount of industrial land and eliminating some industrial use – square footage – in an area that we *want* industrial use. And I read through all the comments and one of the things that struck me was that – and I'd be happy to be corrected if I'm wrong on this – most all of the residents that are abutting this are already 250 feet away from their property line. And so they have – by coincidence, maybe – this huge area setback. So it's not like somebody's getting hit with this closer thing that, you know, they built 50 feet off of their line 10 years ago, 20 years ago, and now – I mean, the current code called for a 250-foot buffer. Just for whatever reason, most all of these houses were built that far away from their own property line, if I understood this right. So going forward, if the buffer was smaller it would be by choice if somebody built an ADU closer to their line or something like that – like they would know, you know, or I'm giving up this buffer that I control to a new building.

My concern is – is that – I support this one, but my main reasons are because the impact is already mitigated by the location of the buildings now to a great extent. There'll be another hundred feet besides that, so the practical buffer is 350 feet to the building. And if somebody chose later to go closer, then, you know, they would know the new status, the new code that would be in place, if this were to be approved. And if we don't maximize our industrial uses there then that just means it's going to push somewhere else someday. Maybe it'll be 25 years, it might be 40 years, but someday it's going to push somewhere else against another neighborhood

somewhere someday, and the Port is probably the, you know, the best place for this use. And I know that there's people that have tried to get property along I-5 rezoned like this, and they've just been rejected over and over and over – north of Burlington. And so for those reasons, I actually would support this.

Chair Raschko: Anybody else? You've already had a chance – have you?

Commissioner Day: I made the motion but I haven't spoken to it.

Chair Raschko: Okay, make your case.

Commissioner Day: I have a question for Mr. Eckroth. So I appreciate your comments about the existing buffers that exist because of where people have built their homes. I think that's true. We had some comments from Sunrise Lane. But then there's a neighborhood that's Bayhill, and those are smaller lots. Do you know if that's – I don't think those lots *allow* for a 250-foot buffer on their own property. Do you recall?

Mr. Eckroth: No, those are smaller lots. The difference between those lots and the lots that I believe Commissioner Woodmansee's referencing, which is north of Peterson Road, is they're actually in the Bayview Ridge Urban Growth Area zoned Bayview Ridge Residential where the parcels to the north are zoned Rural Reserve. So as – not a *result*, but those parcels are larger in size, which is consistent with that zoning.

I will say that the Port is currently – they submitted a binding site plan application for development adjacent to those smaller lots south of Peterson Road. They are planning for a 100-foot buffer for *all* development. Because right now the 250-foot buffer that we're discussing is just for loading areas. There's actually a 50-foot setback in place right now for other aspects of development. So they're going above and beyond just from a setback perspective, and based on the plan that we've received, I believe that they're putting some lower impact uses adjacent to those residences such as restaurants, things like that, that would serve the industrial uses adjacent.

Commissioner Day: Mm-hmm. Thank you for that.

Mr. Eckroth: Yeah.

Commissioner Day: So may I comment? Well, I've also really struggled with this because I definitely sympathize with the many commenters that we've received comments from that are basically all, except for the applicant, opposed to this. And it seems to me that we need to have a driver of our economy and some amount of predictability. And that's true for businesses but it's also true for individuals who've invested probably a big part of their life savings into their homes. And so I think that their concerns about property values and enjoyment of their property is something that I certainly appreciate. And I also think that there probably is some kind of solution to this that might not just be changing the buffer requirements. It sounds like what you were just describing in terms of the Port of Skagit, there could be ways to, you know, put the loading docks on the other side from the residences or – you know, it seems like there's a solution here but we just – we haven't quite captured the nuance. And so I think, from my perspective, I agree that we need those industrial areas and the Port of Skagit is a huge asset to this county and an economic driver that we very much need. But at the same time, there was predictability established for those who owned the Light Industrial-zoned properties when this was established, and people on the other side made investments in their homes and residences based on *their* understanding of what the regulations were. So I think there's a solution but this isn't it.

Mr. Eckroth: Chair, may I make a – just a quick follow-up comment to that? I just wanted to point out too that the existing code and the proposed code actually eliminates that buffer requirement if you put your loading areas on the other side of the building. So I just wanted to note that for the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Day: Thank you.

Vice Chair Candler: Did you say that was a *change* to the code?

Mr. Eckroth: No, that's actually existing. So that 250-foot buffer doesn't apply if you put your loading area on the other side of the building from that residential zone.

Commissioner Hutchison: So it's still going to be about 100 feet away, depending on the size of the building.

Mr. Eckroth: It could be 50 feet away, based on current code.

Commissioner Day: If you do one thing, then you're still shrinking the buffer.

Vice Chair Candler: And when you showed us that – I guess it was when we did our workshop type meeting, there was a 'path' and a 'plan.' Is that plan tied to this petition or is that plan happening regardless? What's the deal with that?

Mr. Eckroth: That's the application I was referencing that the Port submitted. I believe that was actually shown last year as part of that rezone application that the Port submitted. So the property owner to the north actually submitted this separate from the Port. The Port has written two comments in support of it but they were not the ones who submitted the amendment application. It was John Bouslog, who owns the property to the north.

Vice Chair Candler: Right, so how is – I'm just trying to figure out how that applies to our decision tonight.

Mr. Eckroth: Just additional context of what's being planned to the south right now adjacent to those residences, because Commissioner Day asked about the potential impact to those residences and I just wanted to note that there is an application in that already has a plan using current code.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Eckroth: Yeah.

Chair Raschko: I spent a substantial amount of time looking on the County iMap next to on my other screen Google Earth, and just looking at what all this stuff looked like. And I agreed with what Commissioner Woodmansee said at first because using my little measure tool I could see how some of these five-acre or whatever they were lots that are zoned Rural Reserve. It was almost an eighth of a mile from the back of the house to where the 250 feet would end. And I thought, you know, What are they complaining about? I think if you look further – and I just went around the whole perimeter – there are an awful lot of houses, particularly a development and in the country club that are on small lots, and if the back of the house is 30 feet from the property line I'd be surprised. And that's the vast majority, it looks like to me. And so I developed sort of a

little bit of empathy for them because these were rules that were in place, and the land next to them, I understand, was zoned residential until the FAA or somebody decided that those houses would be too close to the airport so it switched to industrial and all of a sudden they want to reduce this. So I was very empathetic to those people and thinking maybe this isn't good. But the other aspect of it is that if you can turn the building around and have your loading dock away from the neighbors and you have a 50-foot setback, I don't see why there needs to be any change.

Vice Chair Candler: Can I say one more thing?

Chair Raschko: Please.

Vice Chair Candler: I find those comments persuasive as well. I just – what I saw in a lot of the comments was that people were perceiving the idea of this as a benefit to just this one landowner and this huge windfall of money that they would get. And I just didn't look at it that way. I just wanted to say that. I looked at it as trying to maximize the use of the lands that have been identified for this use. And so – and the Port also commented. We had the petitioner but also the Port commenting in favor. So I just wanted to mention that. But I'm really torn on this one, I will say.

Mr. Eckroth: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Any other comments?

Commissioner Hughes: Chair?

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Hughes and then – are you next? No? Okay.

Commissioner Hughes: I would like to go to some of the goals of that area up there. And the reason I went this direction is a little bit further down. We have LR24-04, which are airport amendments regarding getting the community to sign a letter acknowledging that this is up there and that they are there. It took me back to the Comp Plan Goal 2B, and that says/states: "Strengthen community identity and maintain a high quality of a life through creative high quality design." And the objective would be 2B(2): "Adopt development standards that strengthen community character and identity. Restriction does not achieve this objective." Following down, Policy 2B(2)(4): "Require industrial development adjacent to residential areas to provide a site-obscuring buffer of a size and composition adequate to reduce visual and audial impairments and provide vegetative relief."

I'm not confident that the code change can achieve this for the light industrial to residential landscape. And where my reality is is that on a flat level of topography noise can travel a quarter-mile to two miles. And I'll put that into my own life experience. We had a neighbor a quarter-mile away rebuild an old barn – took down the old barn, rebuilt a new, which was a lovely addition to our community. But the summer of the materials being dropped off every morning and the forklift working those materials where they needed to go for staging, it woke us up every morning and it just was a \_\_\_. When fall came, we went, The barn's up. Good. It's over.

Half a mile away there's another neighbor that has a loading dock. Agriculture? That's totally acceptable. But there's a telephone that rings outside on the dock and we can hear it a half-a-mile away. I feel that if we could get a site plan over this to where we can control some of those, a loading dock, not only will it put – if the building's between that and residential, it also puts more of a sound barrier for that noise. It makes the noise go up and down rather than straight across. I really appreciated the suggestion from the writer who said – let me see; I'm pretty sure I wrote it

down – that whole area needs to have a plan attached to it, and the Port could possibly help achieve this between the Port property and the light industrial so we can see where the roads are going to be.

As my understanding, I was not a part of the 2014. It was my first meeting. I saw the public here. I saw that it was a federal overlay that needed to happen. There wasn't really a decision on that one. But this time there's a decision for that whole area to see the concept: What are the roads? Where do the roads go? How are you going to handle all that traffic? We've had comments regarding the trucks. Are they going to go through the roads that were developed for it or are they going to continually be able to use the back side roads? The whole purpose of this area was to move commodities. And I think it's good for that but I do think it needs to be planned so the community around it can understand and be best protected from that. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Any other comments? Commissioner Hutchison?

Commissioner Hutchison: I'd just like to thank Commissioner Hughes for that comment. To be able to understand the overall plan would be really helpful, I think, not just for us but for the entire community. I have the ultimate faith that our Port will be able to design and build their structures the way they need to be for them to house the materials they're looking to house and transport in a kind and *fairly* impactful way. I mean, that the community will appreciate that they're there rather than having to feel like they need to defend their buffers. So I just feel like a little bit more conversation is potentially going to be able to make a huge difference in the surrounding neighbors appreciating what's to come and really being able to – really be able for the Port to expand the way they need to. I have no doubt in my mind that they'll be able to, regardless of our motion here tonight.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Woodmansee: So the discussion tonight raises a lot of good topics, a lot of good conversation. And I can sit here and listen to this conversation and say that there's a lot of good thoughts out there and that maybe it's not time to do something like this and there could still be a win-win out there in the future. And so I think that there's been a lot of good discussion that maybe merits to take a step back.

Chair Raschko: Anything else?

Commissioner Wright: Sorry, thank you. Can you clarify? You just made a comment on \_\_\_\_\_, but if the building were to put the load deck away from the residential area, they would lose that buffer and it could be less than 50 feet from our residences. Is that what you said?

Mr. Eckroth: I'll pull up the code, if that's okay.

Commissioner Wright: Okay, thank you. \_\_\_\_\_ clarify. Because \_\_\_\_\_ takes away all of what we want, it takes away all the sound barrier and all of the support for a buffer that to give the residents their character and integrity. Josh Wilson and Peterson just are two-lane roads. They're already inundated. So I'm concerned about that.

Mr. Eckroth: So I think the idea is that – so I'll just read this here. So this is for the buffer between industrial and residential land. The first item is for loading areas in particular. It says "Truck-loading operations and maneuvering areas may not be located within 250 feet of areas zoned for

residential use unless the loading and maneuvering area is located on the opposite side of the building from a residential zone.”

Commissioner Wright: So 10 feet away? I mean, how – there is no code.

Mr. Eckroth: So there’s a 50-foot setback. So they’d have to abide by that existing –

Commissioner Wright: So 50 feet no matter what?

Mr. Eckroth: Yes.

Commissioner Wright: Okay. Thank you for –

Commissioner Hutchison: (unintelligible)

Commissioner Wright: But there’s this light and sound and noise and traffic and congestion. So I think that clarified it. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So in theory you could have a 50-foot setback to a building, a hundred-foot deep building, and then your loading dock could be there.

Mr. Eckroth: Correct.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Because it’s on the other side of the building.

Mr. Eckroth: Right. I think the idea is that the building itself would act as a sound barrier.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Correct.

Mr. Eckroth: Yeah.

Vice Chair Candler: That would still only get to –

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, it’s less than 250 but it’s on the other side. So the building provides a buffer, a sound barrier.

Chair Raschko: Are we ready to vote?

Commissioner Henley: Yes.

Chair Raschko: All right. Commissioner Hughes, did you have something?

Commissioner Hughes: Just to follow-up on that: Ideally, yes, but then we still have the height of that building and it will be closer to the residential. It’s concerning to me. A plan would – a plan of how this all was going to come out that’s thoughtful with the roads – because you could also put the roads on the outside and that way it would take care of a lot of the buffering too. But I’d like to see how it interacts, how it interfaces with the community.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Are you able to read back the motion?

Mr. Eckroth: I did not – verbatim. I just –

Vice Chair Candler: So we reject.

Mr. Eckroth: Yeah, I believe “reject” was the word. I think we typically say “deny.” Right now the way that’s written is: “The Planning Commission recommends that the Board of County Commissioners \_\_\_\_reject or deny the Bayview Ridge Light Industrial Buffer and Landscaping Amendment.”

Chair Raschko: Does that sound –

Unidentified Commissioner: Sure.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So all those in favor of approving the motion, say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And does anybody wish to abstain?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Now we can do Findings of Fact.

Mr. Eckroth: Yes. Thank you. I can count – I promise. So as you may notice, I did not write up suggested Findings of Fact for this petition as I was not sure which direction the Planning Commission would go. So I want to leave a clean slate here.

Chair Raschko: That’s probably a wise idea. Commissioner Day?

Commissioner Day: I would say one of our Reasons for Actions is that we value the Light Industrial property owned by the Port of Skagit and other owners and we encourage that development. I would say at the same time we respect the existing regulations to ensure that the property owners continue to enjoy the use of their property.

Vice Chair Candler: You got just a little bit ahead of him. He needs –

Commissioner Day: Sorry!

Vice Chair Candler: However, the Planning Commission also recognizes –

Mr. Eckroth: I paraphrased a little. I hope you don’t mind.

Commissioner Day: Yeah. Well, you can help. I don’t want to wordsmith – poor guy! I don’t want to be a wordsmith, but I think our interest is in ensuring that the existing homeowners continue to have the enjoyment and use of their property based on existing regulations.

Chair Raschko: Would you want all that part of the same finding, or would that be too –



Commissioner Day: I don't have a preference.

Vice Chair Candler: I think it has to be part of the same because you wouldn't have a standing alone as a reason to reject this. I mean the first sentence \_\_\_\_.

Chair Raschko: Okay, anybody else?

Vice Chair Candler: I have one.

Chair Raschko: Yes?

Vice Chair Candler: It would be separate.

Mr. Eckroth: Is everyone okay with what I wrote?

Chair Raschko: Do we want to assure?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I think that's too strong of a word.

Chair Raschko: Yeah.

Vice Chair Candler: We are concerned about the impacts?

Commissioner Day: I have another thought.

Chair Raschko: Okay, please.

Commissioner Day: It seems that the existing code does allow for smaller setbacks and so there is still an opportunity for dense use of the property if they arrange it in a way where they can maximize the use of the setback.

Mr. Eckroth: I'm trying my best to paraphrase here. It's hard for me to go \_\_\_\_\_.

Chair Raschko: Would you want to say "The existing code allows for flexibility"?

Commissioner Day: Mm-hmm, yeah. That's a great way of saying it.

Chair Raschko: Do we want to say anything about the fact that these people might have purchased their property based on the existing buffers?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a comment on that. That's something that we run into a lot. And if that was a reason for *not* doing projects, there'd be a lot of projects not done, on the one hand. So if we can think about that concept in context to what you're trying to say, maybe. Because we run into that in every project we do. Every single project. That's been like that forever.

Chair Raschko: You mean the rules changing.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, rules change. Zoning changes. All that changes over time.

Commissioner Hughes: Chair?

Chair Raschko: Okay. Then I don't want to say that.

(laughter)

Commissioner Hughes: I have a direction for this to go. Would this be a time to put that we'd like to see some County/Port land use conversation of how that whole area is going to come forward?

Chair Raschko: Are you saying, like, it would be nice to see a site plan?

Commissioner Hughes: Oh, a site plan's a good – a short way to say that, but there's other comments.

Vice Chair Candler: My guess is that this is probably *the* most – of not one of but *the* most discussed areas in our county as far as planning. I'm just throwing that out there. This is not something I think that is being done willy-nilly. I just want to say that.

Commissioner Woodmansee: We could say that this particular location creates a unique – there's not very many places where you're trying to mix those two uses, so basically the uniqueness of the residential against the industrial creates the need for more intense or more – I'm back to a site plan, right? It needs a master plan. That's what it needs. This area needs a master plan that includes all property owners in this area, and so it'd be better suited if there was a master plan for the entire area. That's what I'm trying to say.

Chair Raschko: Before we change setback rules and all of that?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Correct.

Commissioner Day: That allows for additional community engagement? Is that part of master planning process?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, sure. Sure it would.

Commissioner Day: I think that sounds like a good finding.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Because now you know where the road's going to go.

Commissioner Day: Yeah.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Who's the winners, who's the losers? Where are you taking the road from? Is this guy's property giving up all the road or is this guy? And maybe there's a give and take in a master plan that the Port and the property owners can negotiate between them, you know? And there might be some boundary line adjustments that happen because of a master plan so that, you know, people are treated fairly within the master plan in this area. I mean, a master plan –

Chair Raschko: Okay. You want to suggest some verbiage here?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Um –

Chair Raschko: Or would you like to?

Commissioner Day: I think Commissioner Woodmansee's more familiar with the master plan. I'm just –

Commissioner Woodmansee: I would say the location of the residential housing or the residential lots and the Light Industrial area create an opportunity or a necessity that a master plan would be a better vehicle to achieve the balance that the proponents are looking for. Something like that.

Commissioner Day: I have a question.

Commissioner Woodmansee: And I don't know if that process is even out there, Robby!

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Day.

Commissioner Day: I have a question about that. What's the benefit to the property owners to engage in such a process instead of just coming in with a compliant site plan and project proposal?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Is that for me?

Commissioner Day: Yeah.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, there may not be a benefit. They might be better off just, Hey, I like the code the way it is if we're not going to make this change. And I'm going to build to this setback and put my stuff on this side. Or, if a master plan has roads strategically placed that, you know, helps their particular site be developable better, that might be a benefit of a master plan.

Commissioner Day: It could lead to code changes that would be beneficial?

Commissioner Woodmansee: It could lead to code changes that would be beneficial *or* it could lead to just *use* that's beneficial within the existing code.

Commissioner Day: Got it.

Commissioner Woodmansee: But if you plan the area out as a whole and know where you're proposing roads to be, I mean, that *affects*, you know, buffers and stuff like that. And so –

Commissioner Day: Would that involve a SEPA process, or that would be at the project level?

Commissioner Woodmansee: A master plan, I think, would be –

Mr. Eckroth: Yes, it would certainly involve SEPA. I don't know if there's a mechanism in code right now or a comprehensive plan to require a master plan, so that would probably require some additional changes just in preparation of that.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So it wouldn't have to be required, but a group of people could come in – could they come in and apply for a master plan for the industrial area?

Mr. Eckroth: So –

Commissioner Woodmansee: Or not?

Mr. Eckroth: I mean, right now the Port has a three-phase binding site plan process up there they're going through. So what – they're effectively doing that, but it's separate from any Planning Commission process. There's a public notification component to it. It is an administrative decision, though, just based on the number of lots that they've applied for so far.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So does that include the privately-owned property or just the Port property?

Mr. Eckroth: So it could be both. Currently all we've seen is just from the Port.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay.

Mr. Eckroth: For just one of three phases.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay.

Commissioner Day: Could you just call it a community planning process to engage the community that could lead to potential code changes or compromises? I mean, I think you'd have to facilitate that by someone, which I think is a great idea. But I just don't know what that would look like in terms of County staffing or funding availability. I like your idea, though, a lot.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, the master planning would be Port or private owner-driven, not County-driven, I would think.

Commissioner Day: Yeah.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Maybe the application process, but –

Mr. Eckroth: Right. But just to make sure we're clear that we don't have a master plan application.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So it's a binding site plan.

Mr. Eckroth: Right. Right.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I mean, that's just a play on words – virtually the same process.

Mr. Eckroth: Right. Right.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So Commissioner Woodmansee – to see, reflect your thinking.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Would it be better if we said binding site plan process versus master plan, since we don't have a master plan process?

Mr. Eckroth: Well, just to add some additional clarity. So the binding site plan process, they'd have to use existing code.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Correct.

Mr. Eckroth: So there's no way to amend the code utilizing that process. So that's the current avenue that they have, is – if they want to subdivide their existing lot into multiple lots for eventual multiple owners within that property.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah. And my assumption is that if that process was gone through, it would be under the current code, short of a new amendment request or a code change by the Commissioners. And so it achieves, I think, what Amy's looking for – is, Hey, look at the thing as a whole. And that's the type of process you'd go through to do that. You may or may not have willing contributors to it but if they're not willing to contribute then at this point their option's existing code. Does that make sense?

Commissioner Day: Could you say something like a community engagement process – we would encourage a community engagement process that involves – I think the concern that I have about how this would work is most of the property is owned by the Port of Skagit but not all of it, so, you know, are they going to develop it all at once, you know? It's hard to show a master plan when you really don't know maybe how you're going to develop all of it. There's a lot of undeveloped land up there so it's hard to come in with a whole vision for it when you might not have it yet.

Commissioner Woodmansee: If I could get a point of clarification from Robby? So right now it's an administrative process you're going through?

Mr. Eckroth: Depending on the number of lots they apply for, I believe so. I don't think they have to go through the Hearing Examiner, at least with their first phase. I'm not sure what the next two phases will bring and I'm not sure what the petitioners' plans are.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Sure.

Mr. Eckroth: I've actually heard him say he plans to sell it. Whether that's before or after a binding site plan, I'm not sure.

Commissioner Woodmansee: The petitioner on *this* petition.

Mr. Eckroth: Yes. Yeah.

Chair Raschko: Where are we?

Commissioner Henley: I think we should go.

Commissioner Woodmansee: We could just say an opportunity for further –

Commissioner Day: – community engagement?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Or dialogue, and I guess “communication” is fine, but – I'm on board with what Amy's trying to say, which is look at the thing as a whole. And so however we can say that, I guess, is what I'm trying to say.

Commissioner Henley: That sounds like a different petition.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, we're denying it. One of the reasons are –

Commissioner Henley: We can deny this one. We already voted on it.

Commissioner Woodmansee: We didn't, but...

Commissioner Henley: (laughter)

Chair Raschko: Do we really have to recommend what they do going forward?

Commissioner Woodmansee: No, we don't. And it can –

Commissioner Hutchison: Again it's more of a desire. Rather than creating the opportunity it's more of a desire for us to have a better understanding of the long vision. Like what is that – it's hard for us to sit here and say, Yeah, we just change the code and update your buffers, but we don't know what the objective down the road looks like. So it's really – it's just hard to make that adjustment without really knowing what it looks like on paper. Like I said earlier, they have so much opportunity to develop just as the code sits today. And I know they're creative and they've got design options, and there's absolute ways for them to move forward without changing current code and be able to develop that site.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, maybe that's what it should say here.

Chair Raschko: Well, I think we're overcomplicating this and that. I mean, what we were starting out, I thought, to do is to make a nice little thing – it'd be nice if you guys did this.

Commissioner Wright: Yeah.

Chair Raschko: But now we're sitting down trying to figure out what the County's going to do to go forward and that's not our job here. Our job right now is explain why we were recommending that they deny it.

(sounds of agreement)

Chair Raschko: So if we could do that. So if anybody wants to add anything – and how does everybody feel about (c) at this point?

Commissioner Day: Could you read (c)? Is that where it talks about flexibility in the existing code?

Chair Raschko: It now says: "The location of the residential lots in the Light Industrial area creates an opportunity for a master plan to achieve a balance for the proponents."

Commissioner Woodmansee: "...and neighboring property owners"?

Commissioner Day: I think that's confusing.

Commissioner Hutchison: (a) and (b) might be all we need \_\_\_\_\_.

Commissioner Day: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Woodmansee: If we want to strike (c), I have no issue with that.

Chair Raschko: Okay, what's the consensus? Strike (c)?

Commissioner Wright: Yes.

(several Commissioners speaking at the same time)

Commissioner Wright: \_\_\_\_\_ conversation. Just say we want to talk more about it. But go ahead – strike it. It’s fine.

Chair Raschko: Okay, is there anything else we want besides (a) and (b)?

Vice Chair Candler: I think it’s okay when our reasons are simple. I think that covers it.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I’m fine with that.

Chair Raschko: All right. So we move on. LR24-04. Now we have the Airport Environs Overlay Amendments. Is there a motion?

Commissioner Hutchison: I move that the Board of County Commissioners approve this amendment.

Commissioner Henley: Second.

Chair Raschko: It’s moved and seconded to recommend to the Board of Commissioners that they approve the Airport Environs Overlay amendments. Is there any discussion?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. All those in favor of the motion, say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And are there any abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, so that passes. So we have Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action.

Mr. Eckroth: So I wrote up some suggestions, mostly based on state law, County code, and goals and policies of the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan that speak to the type of development that occurs within the Bayview Ridge area and that discourage uses within the airport area.

Chair Raschko: Oh, please go ahead.

Commissioner Wright: Does (d) contradict what we just did with LR24-02? Are they two separate components \_\_\_\_? I’m not seeing it in my mind. \_\_\_\_\_ saying that we have codes, they can’t develop too close to it, but now we’re saying go ahead and do it. \_\_\_\_\_ community, it’s kind of – it’s contradictory.

Mr. Eckroth: I think my thought when I put that in there was just the fact that you have the airport industrial uses and surrounding residences all together, and so the intent of the disclosure is to

warn people that the airport's there. I get what you're saying, though. I just wanted to explain my reasoning.

Commissioner Wright: No, I hear that. I just hope we're not saying develop but don't develop, and now go ahead and develop.

Commissioner Hutchison: To create a place in the community.

Commissioner Henley: Most things around airports are regulated by the FAA, not by locals.

Mr. Eckroth: Correct. There are some standards that we can put in there and the disclosure is more just a warning for any potential buyers that they might be limited in what they can do based on those facts.

Chair Raschko: This is similar to the right to practice agriculture, the right to practice forestry – things that you have to sign when you buy a house.

Mr. Eckroth: Correct.

Chair Raschko: All it is doing is acknowledging that you know what goes on next door and you won't object to it.

Mr. Eckroth: And there's also some clarification of certain types of performance standards within the existing overlay to be more consistent with the FAA regulations, because when they were first written they were based on Australia's guidance because the FAA didn't have it in place at the time.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So how farther down the list are we?

Vice Chair Candler: How many are there?

Commissioner Hutchison: I'm going to – we have one, two, three more.

Chair Raschko: It goes through (h).

Vice Chair Candler: Can you scroll down a little bit?

Chair Raschko: Here we go. Has anybody any objection to (a) through (h)?

Commissioner Henley: No, I like (h). I think that's good!

Chair Raschko: All right, are you ready to entertain a motion to approve these?

Vice Chair Candler: We're just getting a consensus.

Chair Raschko: We're doing consensus. Have we consensus?

(affirmative sounds from several Commissioners)

Chair Raschko: All right.



Vice Chair Candler: Okay.

Chair Raschko: We're going to move on to LR \_\_ C24-1, Countywide Planning Policies Update. Disband Boundary Review Board. Is there a motion? Yes? Commissioner Day.

Commissioner Day: I move that we recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that they adopt C24-1 regarding the Boundary Review Board.

Unidentified Female Commissioner: And I'll second.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded to recommend adoption of C24-1. Is there discussion of the motion? Commissioner Day?

Commissioner Day: I really have mixed emotions about this. I feel like this is an opportunity for citizens to participate in a public process and I understand that there are criteria for disbanding the boundary review boards, but in some ways it feels to me like that presumes that we have already established all the UGAs and they're going to be annexed, and we've already adopted all the special purpose districts. And so if that's not true, if in the future we want to have a self-contained community or a new special purpose district then to me the process is less certain from a citizen's perspective about how that gets done. But I understand, based on some questions that I asked of Mr. Eckroth – which I would appreciate if you could speak to these – that there *are* processes. They just don't all look the same in terms of – you know, we haven't reached a static state. We understand that these things are dynamic and there is a process moving forward if we disband boundary review boards.

Mr. Eckroth: Correct. So it depends on the type of special purpose district and the action that's taking place, whether that be a creation of a new special purpose district; it being dissolved; merged if two special purpose districts were sort of merged together or if a boundary is changed. So state law has different requirements for every single one of those circumstances. There is typically an election associated with a lot of those boundary changes within – for the people who are within that special purpose district. So if you're, like, within a dike district, for instance, if there's going to be a boundary change there may be an election. I can't remember off the top of my head if that's one of those processes, but just an example. And then there's typically also a Board of County Commissioner public hearing and approval as well. And something as drastic as like a fully contained community – which is not on the table, that's not being considered at the moment – would require a Countywide Planning Policy amendment, which is *not* being suggested. That would certainly require a lot of public participation – multiple stages likely.

Commissioner Day: Thank you for clarifying that my example is just completely hypothetical.

Mr. Eckroth: Yes.

Chair Raschko: The discussion?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All right then. All those in favor of the motion, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Does anybody wish to abstain?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: No? Okay. We will then move on to the Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action.

Mr. Eckroth: I'll just note to the Planning Commission that the Findings of Fact are what were written from last year by the Planning Commission.

Chair Raschko: We approved them last year, didn't we?

Commissioner Henley: This ought to be a slam dunk.

Chair Raschko: Okay, does anybody have any problems with the Findings of Fact?

Unidentified Commissioner: No.

Chair Raschko: Everybody's okay? All right.

Commissioner Henley: It looks good.

Chair Raschko: We'll then move to C24-2, Fencing. Would anybody like to make a motion?

Commissioner Hutchison: I had a question discussion. Could I ask first?

Chair Raschko: Please.

Commissioner Hutchison: My question, I think, just is about nonconforming use for any existing fencing that might not be set as low as five feet currently. Is there a process that needs to be taken by those homeowners or –

Mr. Eckroth: No. So if this were to be adopted by the Board of County Commissioners and someone were to have a fence that doesn't comply with these regulations, they can keep it; they could repair it; they can replace it, as long as it's in the exact same configuration, it's not going up in height, it's not expanding in location – anything like that. So that's already established in our nonconforming use code that's in Skagit County Code 14.16.800-something.

Commissioner Hutchison: Okay, thank you for –

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Day?

Commissioner Day: I remember that there were comments from particularly the east side of the county regarding their fences for elk and livestock. Were those concerns addressed in any kind of revision from the first time that we read these proposed changes?

Mr. Eckroth: Yeah, so when this was initially being docketed we had a draft set of language and we have changed it since then to specifically exempt any fencing related to agricultural activity or wildlife fencing.

Commissioner Day: Thank you.

Mr. Eckroth: Yeah.

Commissioner Henley: It's mostly about barbs and razor wire actually, right?

Mr. Eckroth: Right, right. So it would prohibit razor wire fencing and barbed wire fencing in certain circumstances. Some zones would still allow it that are industrial or for certain types of uses.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so we're still looking for a motion. Commissioner Day?

Commissioner Day: I recommend that we recommend that the Board of County Commissioners adopt C24-2 regarding Fencing.

Commissioner Henley: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to recommend adoption to the Board of County Commissioners. Is there any discussion?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Now all those in favor, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Any abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, so that is approved. We'll do Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action.

Mr. Eckroth: I wrote (a) through (d) here as a suggestion. I have it on the screen here.

Chair Raschko: I'm sorry. What did you just say?

Mr. Eckroth: Oh, I said that I have on the screen here –

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Mr. Eckroth: – four suggested Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action that were mostly just taken from the staff report.

Vice Chair Candler: Looks good.

Chair Raschko: Okay, any objections to what is written?

Commissioner Henley: No, it looks good.

Chair Raschko: Everybody's happy?

Vice Chair Candler: Mm-hmm.

Chair Raschko: All right. Great. So we'll move on to 24-3, Vehicle Storage Amendment.

Commissioner Henley: I have a question.

Chair Raschko: Please ask it.

Commissioner Henley: Okay. The question is: Does the term "vehicle" apply to not only motorized vehicles but also aircraft and boats?

Mr. Eckroth: That's a good question.

Commissioner Henley: I mean, it seems like you could have junk piles from either of those things in addition to what we think of as motorized vehicles.

Mr. Eckroth: I'm just going to look through the code really quickly, if that's okay.

(silence)

Mr. Eckroth: It would appear we don't have a definition of "vehicles." We do for the existing "inoperable vehicle" definition and "recreational vehicles."

Commissioner Henley: Maybe we should add that.

Mr. Eckroth: So the definition of "vehicle" from the dictionary is "a thing used for transporting people or goods, especially on land, such as a car, truck, or cart." So I don't believe it would include any aircrafts.

Commissioner Henley: If we could get an umbrella in there that works, I think that would be good.

Mr. Eckroth: Just a reminder: We can't make any changes at this time. You can make suggestions, of course, but we can't amend the actual code language today.

Commissioner Henley: Well, it's probably not a large problem but it does leave a hole. I mean, because I have seen aircraft junkyards and certainly we've all seen boat junkyards, so you might want to think about that.

Mr. Eckroth: I'm going to pull up the proposed code language really quickly, because I know it did add a definition for "vehicle storage facility." It did not include that.

Vice Chair Candler: I have a motion.

Chair Raschko: Pardon me?

Vice Chair Candler: I have a motion. I'm moving that we recommend the Board of County Commissioners deny the code amendment until such time as "vehicle" is defined.

Commissioner Henley: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to recommend to the Board of Commissioners that they deny the code amendment. Do we have discussion, please, on the motion?

Commissioner Hutchison: I just wanted to – if I may – clarify. This is in regards to commercial enterprises. This is not a hobbyist?

Mr. Eckroth: Correct. Yeah, yeah. So this clarifies that, where it wasn't exactly clear in existing code for storage of unlicensed and/or inoperable vehicles. So this specifically calls that out, that it would – this new use would be for commercial enterprises and would limit it to two zones.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Day.

Commissioner Day: I appreciate the question and I think it's certainly worth noting that you could also have junkyards with old planes and old boats; however, I think this proposal came to us for a reason. And I think we've discussed this at length in past meetings, and I think it is a good amendment. And I think if we – alternatively to this motion, if we wanted to we could recommend that the Board of County Commissioners also consider adding boats and airplanes, and that would allow staff time to research and see if there are any impacts that we haven't thought of, and also for the Board of County Commissioners to add that and consider that if they would like to at that time. I support a motion to adopt this, not to reject it.

Chair Raschko: Other discussion? Commissioner –

Commissioner Woodmansee: So do we have a definition for “commercial enterprise”?

Mr. Eckroth: I'm guessing no.

Commissioner Day: I would say “an exchange of money.”

Commissioner Woodmansee: Follow-up: So would that mean that some guy that's collected 50 cars and they're all sitting in his yard wouldn't – would not be subject to this code change?

Mr. Eckroth: They are subject to existing code that limits them to 500 square feet unless they put it inside of a building. Yeah.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so where are we? Okay, we have a motion on the floor. Is there more discussion of the motion?

Mr. Eckroth: I'll just note that we have received inquiries from people who are interested in storing vehicles for commercial purposes, not necessarily licensed and/or inoperable, which was an issue for them but they wanted to do it in a residential zone. So that's what brought this to the Department's attention, because it could have potential high impacts to those residential neighbors.

Chair Raschko: All right. So we're going to vote on the motion, which was – once again, please?

Vice Chair Candler: That we deny until such time as “vehicle” is defined. We recommend denial.

Chair Raschko: Okay. All those in favor of the motion, please say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

Multiple Other Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Any abstentions?

Commissioner Hughes: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Who?

Commissioner Hughes: It would be me.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So what have we got? Could we have a show of hands on the ayes? I mean on the approves?

Commissioner Hutchison: Oppose?

Chair Raschko: We've got two opposed.

Vice Chair Candler: Wait. What are we talking about?

Mr. Eckroth: Do you mind? Raise your hand for support again.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Support of the motion?

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, wait a minute. This isn't voting on that. This is voting on her –

Mr. Eckroth: This is voting to reject.

Commissioner Day: To deny.

Mr. Eckroth: Or deny, yeah.

Commissioner Hughes: Was there a second?

Commissioner Day: Yes.

Commissioner Hughes: When we did it.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Vince seconded it.

Commissioner Henley: I did, yes.

Chair Raschko: Can you say your motion again, please?

Vice Chair Candler: My motion was just to reject until such time as "vehicle" is defined. I moved that we recommend the Board of County Commissioners.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so in my mind what we were doing was voting on whether we want to do that, and then we will continue our discussion and perhaps have a motion to approve or disapprove the thing.

Vice Chair Candler: Exactly.

Chair Raschko: Because you – pardon me?

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah, exactly.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So I don't think this applies to your piece of paper yet.

Unidentified male voice: Okay.

Chair Raschko: (unintelligible)

Vice Chair Candler: \_\_\_. You're right. Right.

Commissioner Day: Did the motion fail?

Vice Chair Candler: It was four – what I heard was four and four because there was one abstention. Is that not accurate?

Commissioner Woodmansee: That'd be four and three and –

Commissioner Wright: It was three and four.

Vice Chair Candler: Oh, okay, okay. Right.

Commissioner Hutchison: Now we're missing Kathy.

Commissioner Henley: We'll just do a roll call.

Chair Raschko: We don't need to. We're done with that.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay. We need a new motion.

Chair Raschko: We need a new motion.

Mr. Eckroth: Okay, I'm sorry. I'm following along as well. Okay.

Commissioner Hutchison: You want to go again?

Vice Chair Candler: I don't have a different motion.

Commissioner Hutchison: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Day.

Commissioner Day: I move that we recommend to the Board of the County Commissioners that they adopt C24-3 regarding vehicle storage.

Commissioner Hutchison: I'll second that.

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's moved and seconded to recommend adoption. I would – I would amend it to say with the recommendation that they come up with a “vehicle” definition.

Commissioner Henley: Let's get this clear. We're voting to have the proposition rejected by the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Candler: No, we already did that.

Several Commissioners: Already did that.

Vice Chair Candler: Now we're voting –

Chair Raschko: We're voting to approve it.

Vice Chair Candler: We're discussing whether or not it should be approved, I think, actually.

Chair Raschko: Correct. And I'm recommending that we add a recommendation that “vehicle” be defined.

Commissioner Wright: To be added to that in Findings.

Unidentified Commissioner: Yes.

Commissioner Wright: (unintelligible)

Chair Raschko: So how do we proceed with that?

Vice Chair Candler: That would be a finding. We just vote.

Chair Raschko: All right. Okay. Is there a discussion of the – did we have a second?

Vice Chair Candler: Yes.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Is there discussion of the motion?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All right then, all those in favor of the motion, please raise your hand.

(Seven Commissioners raise a hand.)

Chair Raschko: Okay, all those opposed?

(One Commissioner raises a hand.)

Chair Raschko: Okay. All right. Let's go to Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action.

Mr. Eckroth: I hope it's correct. Thank you.



Commissioner Hutchison: Should we make our first finding a note to please clarify definitions?

Chair Raschko: That's a good idea.

Commissioner Wright: \_\_\_\_\_. Vehicle and commercial? Or just vehicle?

Commissioner Henley: The definition of "vehicle."

Mr. Eckroth: Oh, thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So how do we feel about the Findings of Fact? Or have we not yet perused them sufficiently? Everybody good?

Commissioner Henley: Hmm?

Chair Raschko: Is everybody good with the findings?

Commissioner Henley: I don't have any that are different than these.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So we'll move on to 24-4, General Code Language Clean Up. Is there a motion?

Commissioner Hutchings: I move that we recommend to the Board of County Commissioners approval of C24-4 regarding General Code Language Clean Up.

Vice Chair Candler: I'll second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to recommend approval of C24-4. Discussion, please?  
Commissioner Day.

Commissioner Day: I think we've been very thoroughly briefed on these code changes and the clean-up and I appreciate that in past meetings, so I support the motion.

Chair Raschko: Anybody else?

Commissioner Hutchings: I went back and forth to my old notes on Guemes Island when we recently had our height changes, and I was very careful to make sure we weren't changing anything that I was aware of their intentions being! So I'm fully supportive of the edits.

Chair Raschko: Okay, are we ready for the question? All those in favor of the motion, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And any abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. So that's approved. Now we'll go to Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action. Two are presented. Does anybody have anything for addition?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Mr. Eckroth: Only two suggested.

Chair Raschko: Okay, that then concludes that. Now we need to vote on the entire package.

Vice Chair Candler: I move that we approve this document as a group.

Commissioner Hughes: I'll second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to approve the recorded motion. Is there any discussion? The only discussion I had is to say thank you for everybody moving this along. All those in favor, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And there's no abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. We're done with that. Thank you, everybody.

So Mr. Eckroth, we're done if you have a report for the Department.

Mr. Eckroth: I do. Just a quick update. So effective January, the Department will be taking action minutes for Planning Commission meetings. So we did some research as a result of the Department just looking at ways to become efficient as a whole, especially as we adopt a new permit tracking system. And we did some research and the municipal research service center actually recommends that jurisdictions that have recordings – which we have video recordings here - have action minutes, which actually too far off from what we've been doing. They're just very brief and they capture votes that are made. So we will be presenting a memo and an example at the next December meeting and then that will be in effect in January.

That's all I have.

Chair Raschko: Are there any questions?

Commissioner Wright: I'm not sure if it's appropriate. A 2025 calendar? Is that being presented yet for meeting dates?

Mr. Eckroth: Yes. We're going to present it at the next meeting. Thank you for asking. I was hoping to at least present it at this meeting or at least a draft but we're still working some things out with the consulting team and their schedules. And also there're some factors, like we have to submit notice to the Department of Commerce for state agency review, so we're having to take that into account, So we're still working on it, so thank you for your patience on that.

I will note that March will likely be a little bit of a busy month for the Planning Commission. But after May we'll be likely going down to one Planning Commission meeting a month for the remainder of the year.

Chair Raschko: Anything else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. So we'll go to Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements. So Kiera, have you any announcements?

Commissioner Wright: No. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Jen?

Commissioner Hutchison: I'm just grateful for the Department's work on this and help with the Findings and keeping us in order. It's wonderful. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Joe?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Nothing to add.

Chair Raschko: How about you, Vince?

Commissioner Henley: Yes, I do.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Commissioner Henley: As a matter of fact. Take one of these and pass them down. It's a gift.

Commissioner Hutchison: Oh, thank you.

Vice Chair Candler: Just what I always wanted.

Commissioner Hutchison: Somehow you knew.

Commissioner Henley: Let me explain what it is so that you'll understand. And Robby, I've got a couple for the staff here as well.

Mr. Eckroth: Thank you.

Commissioner Henley: I once asked a subset of this group if anyone had ever read any of the documents from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on climate change, and of course nobody had. So I thought that what I would do is I would make a copy of what I consider to be the most important part of their output, and I'm just going to take a couple of minutes and explain it.

The IPCC, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change – all right? – is a U.N. organization that is divided up into a number of working groups – working groups 1, serialized 1, 2, 3, et cetera, all right? – and they produce reports called “assessment reports” usually about every four years or so. All right? And one of the things that they do put out, it used to be called “Advice to Policymakers” and now it’s called “Summary” – all right? – “for Policymakers.” And in case you haven’t figured it out, we are policymakers, all right? So the U.N. thinks that we should be doing something with this. In order to do something with it, you probably need to understand a little bit about it; hence, the copies. This is your own personal copy. You can keep it, tear it up, throw it away. Read it, if you dare, and you’ll learn something.

What this does is this describes the UNIPCC’s version of what it is we all should be doing to mitigate climate change, all right? It’s not necessarily a scientific document. It is actually a political document, all right? And so you won’t find a lot of science in here. That’s in the other working group and assessment reports. So, you know, if you want to read a lot of that stuff and so on. This is 48 pages. You can easily read it. I recommend that you do since we are, in the U.N.’s point of view, supposed to be doing something about this, and the state thinks that we’re going to have a climate segment in our Comprehensive Plan. So it might behoove us to figure out what it’s going to look like.

What you’ll do is, if you read this you will find their point of view on what it is that we should all be doing, how we should live, what mitigation we should have, and et cetera. If you’ve been following some of the stuff that’s happening recently, you learn that the rest of the world’s view of the United States is that we should be paying for climate change and the bill they estimate to be on the order of one trillion dollars annually. In other words, not once; every year they want a trillion dollars to mitigate climate change, mostly for poor countries. And the bulk of that money will probably go into the pockets of your local dictator. It’s probably not ever going to be used for climate change.

Anyway, I thought I would do a public service and create this document for you. It is – don’t be misled by the “2022.” This is the very latest document that they – like I said, it comes out about every four years or so. And it is supposedly an explanation of how we should do things to mitigate climate change. For example, they tell us what we should do for agriculture, forestry, and other land uses and they list out what we should and shouldn’t be doing. They try to give us an estimate of costs, but I find that’s a little weak. But you can read those for yourself.

So anyway, this will be helpful to us as we go down the pike in terms of putting together something for our own Comprehensive Plan. Because I submit you probably can’t come up with something that is a realistic climate segment without understanding at least part of what’s in this document, all right?

Now the whole – we’re up to – the UNICPP, they put out these assessment reports every couple of years, like about every four years or so. They’re now up to AR6, all right? This is a part of AR6, all right? And that has all the so-called scientific data and rationale and everything else. This is more or less a political document and you should read it that way. It’s not necessarily scientific. Although they quote a lot of science, it’s always without reference. So, yeah, I think that you should have another source of information to come up with what you really believe is happening with the climate. And I’m not trying to put out my own personal view of it. Ever since the IPCC was formed, I’ve been reading their reports. I’m probably one of the few people that’s actually read an entire report – several thousand pages, all right?

So I think that, you know, you will learn something if you read this. It's tedious reading but I think it's important for people like us who are, in fact, policymakers, all right, to come up with an understanding of what's in the document anyway.

So have fun.

Chair Raschko: Well, thank you. I look forward to reading it. Go ahead.

Vice Chair Candler: I just want to say thank you to everybody who works on this commission. I'm always impressed with the work that you guys do and the time that you guys put into this and the thoughtful discussions. So I do appreciate everybody here, and the Department, of course, as well – but they get paid!

(laughter)

Chair Raschko: Angela?

Commissioner Day: Thank you. Yes, I completely agree with Commissioner Candler, and thank you, Mr. Eckroth, for all the good work, and also Tara Satushek. I'm very grateful that someone keeps track of all the expenses and maintenance and facilities, and it's not very glamorous work but it's necessary work and I appreciate there's someone that keeps such careful track of it.

Thank you, Vince, for this report. I hope that we have a link to this in the meeting minutes. We had some comments come in – I can't remember if they were forwarded through staff or sent directly to us – regarding climate change and the Climate Element in the Comprehensive Plan. And I really appreciate those who sent in those comments, just like all the citizens who come and participate and submit comments. It's incredibly helpful. I want to make sure that people understand that all the information that the Commission receives is publicly available on our website, and so this could also be included in our minutes. I think that would be helpful. And thank you to all the Commissioners and all the commenters who guide this work.

Chair Raschko: Amy?

Commissioner Hughes: Nothing more to add.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, thank you, everybody, for – I think it was a good meeting. And we'll stand adjourned (gavel).