

**Skagit County Planning Commission**  
**Work Session: 2025 Periodic Comp Plan Update**  
**December 10, 2024**

**Planning**

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

**Staff:** Jack Moore, Planning Director  
Tara Satushek, Senior Planner

**Consultant:** Clay White, Kimley-Horn  
Bob Bengford, MAKERS (via Zoom)  
Markus Johnson, MAKERS (via Zoom)

Chair Tim Raschko: (gavel) Good evening. The December 10, 2024, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission is now in session. We are missing Commissioners Mitchell and Hughes. Okay. And I'd entertain a motion to approve the minutes of November 19.

Commissioner Vince Henley: I have a correction to the minutes before we do that.

Commissioner Jen Hutchison: I'll second.

Chair Raschko: We have no motion yet.

Commissioner Hutchison: Oh, I thought he said –

Commissioner Kiera Wright: He's got a correction.

Commissioner Hutchison: Oh.

Chair Raschko: If we have a motion and a second then we can discuss and correct.

Commissioner Henley: Okay.

Commissioner Joe Woodmansee: I'll make a motion that we approve the minutes.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Hutchison: I'll second.

Chair Raschko: Good. \_\_\_ seconded to approve the minutes. Is there discussion and changes to the minutes?

Commissioner Henley: Yeah. On the last paragraph where it talks about giving out the intergovernmental panel on climate change, we should delete the two words “Assessment Report” and insert – okay? – “Working Group III...” – Roman numeral three – “...Summary for Policymakers.”

Commissioner Hutchison: I also have a note for correction. My last name is misspelled in a few spots – not that it would change any of the content. Just letting you know.

Commissioner Henley: It’s the wrong document is what it is, okay? It’s a different document. If I’d given you the Assessment Report you would have needed a hand truck to carry it away. As opposed to 48 pages.

Commissioner Hutchison: That’s a big difference.

Commissioner Henley: The difference \_\_\_.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so we have a change to the document name and a change to your name. All right. Okay, interesting. So we have an amendment to the minutes. All those in favor of voting to approve the minutes of November 19<sup>th</sup> as amended, please say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Thank you. We have time tonight for Public Remarks. Is there anybody who wishes to speak before the Planning Commission?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Tara, is there anybody online?

Tara Satushek: \_\_\_\_\_ that would wish to speak or provide public comment? If so, please unmute yourself.

(silence)

Ms. Satushek: No one is unmuting.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so we’ll dispense with Public Remarks and move to our Work Session, the 2025 Periodic Comprehensive Plan Update – Development Regulations. Ms. Satushek?

Ms. Satushek: Thank you. I would like to introduce Clay White with Kimley-Horn. Kimley-Horn is the lead project consultant for the 2025 Periodic Update for our Comprehensive Plan.

Clay White: Is the microphone on? Okay. I didn’t see the red light. So, Planning Commissioners, for the record, my name is Clay White, Kimley-Horn. Thank you, Tara, for the introduction. Tonight

we're going to do a preliminary, kind of overview of development regulation changes that you'll be considering later this spring as part of the Periodic Comprehensive Plan Update. I'm also joined here tonight by Markus Johnson and Bob Bengford from MAKERS, who are leading kind of the code update process. So we'll be sharing some of the slides. They're joining us online so I'll make sure that we're kind of shifting back and forth a little bit.

Just a few goals tonight. We'll want to provide you an update on the project schedule, but I know that after the briefing tonight Tara's going to go into more in-depth kind of what your next six months look like, which will be a lot of additional briefings and hearings as we move forward with the update. We're going to discuss a little bit about the overview and approach to development regulation changes that will be considered as part of the update. We're going to do a little bit of discussion of next steps and, of course, we can answer any questions that the Planning Commission has.

So just a little bit about the schedule. So we're just about to head into 2025. I feel like the end of the year is like this transition. We've spent a lot of this year engaging the community, kind of talking about how things are going in the county and what are your – kind of your strategies and goals as you plan for the next 20 years of growth. As you know, we took kind of a unique approach for this Comprehensive Plan Update. A lot of times with an update you can go through a process where you kind of look at, you know, what's going on in the community and do some of these initial reports; you do engagement; and then you draft a comprehensive plan; and you have meetings and hearings; and then you recommend that to the Board of County Commissioners.

We've broken this up into kind of a more deliberative process for you. So if you remember, over the summer we drafted preliminary draft policies for the Planning Commission to look at. We also opened that up for people interested in the project to be able to provide preliminary comments on draft policies that the County is going to consider. That's kind of a nice process because we get early feedback from people in the community. We get a better sense of the things that are important to them. We also got to hear from you. We're going through the process now of revising all those policies which will go into the draft comprehensive plan. Then we're going to go through the process again. We're going to open that up for the public. We're going to have meetings and hearings with you. But I think we're going to get a better product because we're not rushed our way through this.

So think about tonight as providing that overview of some of the development regulation ideas and concepts that you're going to see in draft form later this winter. So when you see a draft set of code changes, it won't be the first time that you've seen them and it won't be the first time you've heard of them. We just kind of want to walk through some of the things that we're going to be talking about later this year. So this is a good break, because as we get into January, February, March we're going to be teeing up all these important topics for you to be coming back to. So we'll be having a lot of important conversations as we go into 2025.

So a little bit about our approach to development regulations. When we talk about that, that's typically going to be your zoning regulations, critical areas regulations. Those are those kind of implementation of your policies. A policy by itself in your Comprehensive Plan doesn't do anything. There has to be an action behind it. Not every policy is a development regulation. Sometimes your policies talk about an action like coordinating with your Cities or economic development agencies to accomplish certain tasks. So the implementation for policies can happen in a number of different ways, but a lot of times they're going to be implemented through things like zoning or subdivision regulations or critical areas regulations. They're really, really important. And, you know, one of the things to make sure that we keep in mind is you have to have

consistency between your policies and your development regulations. So if you say something in your policies, there has to be a corresponding action on the other end. So you have to have consistencies. You wouldn't want to say something, then have your regulations not be congruent with that. So part of that is syncing that up.

So there's a few things that we look at when we look at updating development regulations. First we're looking at consistency with state law since the last periodic update. We've talked about this before. So when we were looking at some preliminary draft policy changes, one of the categories we were looking at was making sure we're modifying policies consistent with state law changes since the last update in 2016. So where we've seen those changes, we need to update policies, and we also have to update regulations as well.

And there's a tool that we've utilized that's in the record called the Commerce Checklist. It helps you walk through everything that's changed since the last update – all the amendments to state laws. It also goes through state laws that would affect regulations. So you complete that checklist to show your work, just making sure you're syncing everything up.

There's also changes to the Comprehensive Plan land use map. So you have a land use map in your Comprehensive Plan. It corresponds to your zoning map. There has to be consistency between your Comprehensive Plan map and your zoning map. And are development regulations necessary for accommodating your population, housing, and employment targets? So sometimes you have to make zoning changes to add density or to change zones so that you can accommodate more growth population and housing growth. Or sometimes you might create a new zone to provide for more jobs in urban areas. Maybe you don't have a category or a zone that you need in order to be able to accommodate your growth.

We also want to make sure that this isn't just a plan that's just checking state boxes. This is *your* plan. This is *your* community's plan. So what are the things that we're hearing about that implement your kind of community's vision? So, you know, within the construct of our state laws, we should also be looking at, What are the things you want to do? You know, where are you now, where do you want to be in 20 years, and what are the code and policy changes you need to help get you from where you are to where you want to be? And then changes to the critical areas ordinance consistent with Best Available Science.

So just know what we're pulling out of tonight: The critical ordinance briefing. Once that draft code's together that will be a separate briefing where we'll just focus on the critical areas ordinance update. I know there'll be interest in that so we're working on that and that'll come to you this winter. We are also finalizing the revised set of new climate element policy changes, and so we're reviewing this time what implementation of those policies may look like. I don't think it's going to be a lot of new requirements, but we're still kind of working through how that may work within the code. So we will separately brief you on both of those just like we're doing tonight before we get to a public hearing. So we'll have plenty of time to do that.

Just to set some context for you – I mean, I think what's really important to maybe think about as we're going through the draft regulation kind of framework. You know, when the Growth Management Act was adopted in 1990, some communities had zoning back in the '60s and '70s; some didn't. There was a lot of work to get done. There was adopting your first comprehensive plan and it was implementation of a *lot* of new laws – zoning, limitations on densities or promoting densities. You know, advancing critical areas regulations. I mean, there's a lot that's gone through in the last 30 years. This is an update. We're not starting from scratch.

The other piece that we talked about is the – you know, the big kind of change that you would see is if we were accommodating a lot of growth around our cities and those unincorporated urban growth areas. As we've discussed before, the vast majority of the growth is going to happen within cities, and we're not planning for urban growth within those unincorporated urban growth areas because currently the cities don't provide sewer to those areas so we can't accommodate dense growth. If we were planning for growth within those areas, there would be a lot of land use and zoning changes; we'd be planning for more affordable housing types; there'd be a lot more that go – that's going to be a future effort for the County to be working for the Cities on, How do we accommodate growth in those areas going forward? I think it's been a topic, you know, especially as we're focusing more growth in urban areas and less in rural areas. I mean, those areas are going to be needed at some point. I think it's an important conversation. But we're not having it as part of this process, which means we're really focused on our rural and resource lands. And for growth, we're really focused on our rural areas, and it's a very small portion of the growth. So when you're thinking about the development regulation changes in context with other communities across the state, these are a very minor set of code changes that we're going to be looking at. The biggest pieces are always going to be reviewing for the critical areas update, the changes that the County's going to be looking at are the same set of Best Available Science changes that other jurisdictions around the state are having to deal with as well, and, of course, implementation of the Climate Element. But because the growth target is very small, the amount of changes – we're really just looking for those small changes with consistency with state law since the last update. So I just wanted to, like, just frame up in perspective that as we go through this, these are fairly minor changes to the code that we're going to be looking at. In some communities, they're having to accommodate a *lot* of growth, which means a lot of land use changes, you know. And so I just want to just kind of paint that picture for you. I'm happy to answer questions about that as well.

So I've got a few slides. I'm going to turn it over to Markus, and the first category that we wanted – and/or Bob – the first category we wanted to chat with you about was Preliminary Development Regulation Changes, just to provide you an overview. And we're going to focus on the ones for we're trying to get consistency with state law changes since the last update.

Markus or Bob, are you with us?

Markus Johnson: Yep, I'm here. I think Bob's also here. And good evening, everyone. Yeah, I'm Markus Johnson, Associate Planner at MAKERS Architecture and Urban Design, and let me just get going on some of these changes to be consistent with state law.

So I think first we want to touch on STEP Housing. And so STEP is just a kind of acronym to kind of take into approach indoor emergency shelter, transitional housing, emergency housing, and permanent supportive housing. So these are required by recent law changes to be allowed in the – in particular and appropriate residential and commercial zones throughout jurisdictions. And so the changes really would be a small slate of things which add definitions for STEP Housing, so adding a definition for each of these terms of emergency shelter, transitional housing, emergency housing, and permanent supportive housing. And then also allowing for STEP Housing in the appropriate residential and commercial zones. And so what we mean by "appropriate commercial zones" is when you look at these RCWs, or the state law, items like emergency shelter or emergency housing, so those supportive housing types are generally going to be required where hotels are allowed in the county or in the jurisdiction; transitional housing is where residential and hotels are allowed; and then you'll have permanent supportive housing has to be permitted or allowed where residential uses are permitted as well.

This is what we're looking at for STEP Housing. There – next slide –

Mr. White: Markus, I just want to add on one thing. So there's some of these state laws about, you know, the requirements to allow certain types of housing. Most of these housing types are going to happen in urban areas, and the County currently is not facilitating a lot of urban growth. You've got like an urban growth at, like, Bayview Ridge but, like, you have very limited areas where this could actually go in urban areas; however, in the future if growth *is* facilitated in the urban growth areas we have to make sure that we're implementing those laws so that those things would be permitted when other growth is permitted. So I think the scale of where this would be allowed is going to be very limited in the county at this point because of the type of growth the County is permitting.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah, thanks for that clarification, Clay. So next there would be some changes to allow for Unit Lot Subdivision Standards. And so unit lot subdivisions are – allow for the subdivision of parent lots into two or more unit lots that are sellable legal lots with their own tax or parcel number. And this is just another way of saying that it's a tool that the County would have to allow for development types and new housing types to potentially have different flexible ownership options for people to kind of, you know, have a large lot; do a few – three to four – units potentially on how much is permitted within the zoning code. And then rather than have to do kind of a regular large subdivision process can kind of do these unit lots and split up the lots into still sellable legal lots that can then be sold to individual owners that – in a kind of more flexible way than other processes would look like. And so the real change here is just to add a unit lot subdivision standard to Skagit County subdivision regulations and to make it fit within kind of the County's expected housing capacity or housing types that would be allowed.

And then over here on the righthand side are just some examples of what the unit lot subdivision is trying to illustrate. So you have kind of this greater kind of general parent lots. And these examples are kind of taking a more kind of urban kind of viewpoint or average, but it's still getting the point across where you have this large parent lot and you can subdivide, you know, three, four, six units into individual owned lots and then you can also have areas that are shared, whether that's a courtyard or open space or a driveway kind of be shared in common between all the owners.

Mr. White: Markus, can I add on to that just for a second? So I just wanted to – I'll paint the picture for you a little bit. This issue of a unit lot subdivision – I'll explain a little bit – came about as part of the Great Recession back in – after 2008. Builders and homebuyers were having trouble getting lending on condominiums, of purchasing condominiums. So if you think about a triplex and you put a triplex on a piece of property, you have kind of three options. You could rent the units; you could create condominiums where you own the air space. But what unit lot subdivision allows you do to is to subdivide those units so that you own it fee simple, like you own your single-family, detached home. So it should look the same, feel the same as any other type of development. All we're talking about is providing a different type of ownership. So I like to think of this as providing home ownership opportunities whereas typically the other – right now how you would do it is just you would create condominiums for attached units typically. This isn't new, too. This has been implemented by dozens of communities across the state over the last 10 years. There's a little bit on the implementation side, like how you do utilities is a little bit different for this type of development – like you have to run separate utilities to each unit because they're owned, whereas in a condominium you could run one set of utility lines because you own them in common and you maintain them in common. So there's some implementation, but the look and feel is exactly the same. So this could be something that would provide some more home ownership opportunities. Yes, sir?

Chair Raschko: So in diagram number 1, is that a single-family home? And then three lots with a single building spread across them?

Mr. White: Correct. And this is – so again, you’re not going to see this as much in Skagit County yet because – but you will see this in the cities. When you can do more development, urban growth areas will happen. So we’ve had two bills that have passed in the last couple of years, House Bill 1110 and House Bill 1337. And it requires cities and counties to provide more density on existing residential lots. For counties, the County is now going to be required in urban growth areas to allow at least two accessory dwelling units on every urban residential lot. So theoretically, you could talk about somebody having a single-family home and they put two detached ADUs or two attached ADUs or one attached and one detached, and they could now – instead of – they could either rent them; they could create condominiums under a unit lot subdivision; they could subdivide those so they could sell them separately. So that’s kind of what that diagram is showing. It’s going to get more common, especially in our cities, to see, you know, housing units being added on existing single-family lots to provide, you know, what’s called “urban infill.” Where you’re not seeing, you know, multi-family; you know, you’re seeing these more kind of urban infill development. I mean, it’s an opportunity to provide housing that’s more affordable. It may be the new definition of a starter home because there really are no starter homes anymore. They’re just too expensive. But this would provide it so you could own it as home ownership opportunity.

Chair Raschko: Another question, please.

Commissioner Angela Day: Thank you. So are these lots then substandard in size? Or how does that work?

Mr. White: Yeah, it depends on how you’re arranging your code. Under these new state laws on housing they wouldn’t be substandard. The way you really have to think about it is you may have a maximum density in a zone, but then each one of those lots can then add on – for counties, it would be accessory dwelling units in urban areas. For cities, they may have to allow between two and six dwelling units on each individual lot. So it really changes. You can have a minimum density but then it’s going to be an add-on. You still have to meet all of the City or County’s bulk standard requirements, so it doesn’t mean you eliminate setbacks or impervious standards or your tree regulations or anything. But it is trying to provide more flexibility for your development.

Commissioner Day: Thank you. May I follow up? This might be getting ahead, but I love this idea because I think, you know, a lot of people in the lower median income categories don’t have an opportunity for ownership, and so I think this is really helpful to expand those opportunities, like you said. The question I had reading the briefing ahead of time is, Could something like this be used for the tiny home and mobile home parks that you mentioned in your briefing? Because I think one of those problems is if somebody owns the park and if they decide to sell it, the people don’t have, you know, a place to go. But if they own their little tiny lot with a tiny home then, you know, they are there. It’s theirs forever and they have ownership of it.

Mr. White: Yes. So it can be used for that.

Commissioner Day: Okay.

Mr. White: So, I mean, you could theoretically have a mobile home park where it’s owned by one person and you just rent the spot. You could have them where they’re condominiumized and you own your pad, you own the space. And then this would allow you to – you could subdivide those

units if you – so this would provide that other option. The nice thing is if you have questions about how all of this would work, you've got the right team, because Markus and Bob led the statewide effort of writing the guidance for the state of Washington. They've done a phenomenal job doing that. So this is going to affect the county less than the cities right now. But this does provide some options. I mean, this could work if we provide some housing options in our Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Developments – those little rural communities. That could be a home ownership option.

Commissioner Day: Yeah. Yeah. Thank you.

Mr. White: Markus, back to you?

Mr. Johnson: All right. And here is just a kind of a list of some other changes – and these are very, very small – where you're adding behavioral health facilities to a list of essential public facilities. So you already have in your current standards and in your current code kind of a list of essential public facilities. And that can – you know, so many of those things you can think of and behavioral health would just be kind of another thing that's added to that. They add it there as part of as RCW 36.70A(200).

And then the last kind of change in this kind of category or bucket of changes for consistency development regulations-wise is to revise or delete the current definition of "family" within your definitions or within kind of any use or regulation that tries to regulate households or the amount of people that can live within a certain household based off of familial relations to each other. So that's what this RCW's just kind of saying – that trying to move away from counties and other jurisdictions limiting the number of unrelated people occupying a household or dwelling unit and just allowing kind of a household to be how it's structured. And because we know with housing affordability becoming such a large issue in the state that – you know, families or households just have a different constitution to them. They're not always the kind of the traditional setup and sometimes people are all kind of – friends are all living within the same household together to try and save rent or to try to make sure that they can live kind of comfortably and affordably within an area. So that's what this law is trying to alleviate there.

Mr. White: It was kind of interesting when this law change came up because I thought about being in college and renting a house with four or five of my friends, but we're all from different family units but I felt like we were family. I mean, it's going to be a pretty minor change. I mean, I think even if you have regulations that don't allow that – regulating something like that was almost impossible anyway so it's just kind of cleaning up that definition.

Okay, so I want to talk a little bit about growth targets, and then we're going to talk about some options to accommodate growth. You know, if you don't have questions tonight, these are things to be thinking about as we go forward with the development regulations. I know Tara and Jack and Robby are also talking with the Board about how we're going to approach code changes to accommodate your growth targets.

It's a little bit hard to read...but the County has gone through the process of being allocated housing, population, and job targets. This is focused on housing. And we talked about this really early in the preliminary policy update when we were talking about the Housing Element. But state laws have changed a little bit. So in the past the County and the Cities would get together and you would say, You're planning for 5,000 people and you're planning for 10 and you're planning for 12. You would allocate the amount of growth that the County and the Cities together are expecting and then you'd all go to your plans But you're just trying to accommodate population.



So you just have to accommodate enough people. So it didn't really matter how you did that. You just had to make sure that you had enough zoned capacity – so you had enough room – to accommodate all of those people. You could subdivide enough lots; you had enough room to be able to do that. A bigger challenge for Cities because the County's pretty big. And, you know, you could accommodate growth pretty easily. State – yes?

Commissioner Henley: It seems that could be a pretty important table here. Can we get a better copy of it? I've got several copies and they're all unreadable.

Mr. White: Yes, we can get – and this has just been amended, too, because the County's gone back to SCOG to get some of these –

Commissioner Henley: I would appreciate a complete copy.

Mr. White: Yes, we can do that. Tara, will you get that email out to the Planning Commission?

Ms. Satushek: I'll email that to the Planning Commission.

Mr. White: Okay, so this is – the reason it's in yellow you see some red lines through is that after we started the Comprehensive Plan update, the Department of Commerce – who really works on housing issues – issued some additional guidance saying within rural areas, the County really can't accommodate housing for people that make between zero and 30% of the area median income and 31 to 50% of the median income. And the reason we'll go through in a minute is because the housing types that people can afford when they're within those income brackets is going to be multifamily housing. And you can't typically have multifamily housing in rural areas because that's more of what you'd see in urban areas or you need water and sewer, you need – you want people to be close to where there're jobs and transportation and all of these different things. So we worked – the County worked with SCOG to remove those targets, that zero to 50% AMI housing targets.

So our state law change that you see is really that the County has to get more granular, where you're not just planning for people but you're planning for the housing types that people need – that were for people that make different incomes. And so it's really – it's not just saying, We can have capacity for people. It's that we need – if we have a certain amount of people that we're planning for between 51 and 80% of the area median income, you should have housing types that also correspond that people could afford that make that much money. Does that make sense? It's just a little bit more complicated. It's even more complicated because we're looking at rural areas. Rural areas are intended to be rural, maintaining rural character. We want to prevent low density sprawl. There are no urban services. So this is more of a challenge.

Commissioner Henley: I have another question prepared.

Mr. White: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Henley: In your document there's a term you use which I'd like some explanation of. This is on page 2. It says, okay, "Therefore Skagit County will have to allow more housing types while still maintaining rural character and not allowing growth to result in low density sprawl." How does low density sprawl differ from, say, the way we've put houses in farmland in the rural areas? I mean, it seems to be a term that had – connotes something bad and I'd like to understand the difference.

Mr. White: Yeah. I mean, I think that you're trying to – you're trying to manage growth so it doesn't get to such an intensity within a concentrated rural area that you start seeing the need to provide urban services in rural areas. So it's a bit nuanced because it's going to be different for every community, but let's say in your rural areas you allow clustering of homes in a subdivision where you can put six or seven homes in a cluster and you preserve a lot more open space. That's okay and that's an innovative zoning technique that is permitted under the Growth Management Act because you can preserve more. But what if 50 neighbors all did the same thing and they clustered all their homes right next to each other? Then you've got a residential neighborhood in a rural area. So there's some point that you cross that you're trying to say you're trying to prevent too much concentrated growth in a rural area where you're starting to need the services that you would typically see in urban areas, like fire and police and schools and other things \_\_\_\_\_.

Commissioner Henley: Is one of the triggers of this a supply of, say, water and sewage functions?

Mr. White: Correct. I mean, water is what's called an urban governmental service and rural governmental services, so you could be on wells or you could have a public water system in rural areas. Sewer is a trigger. You can't have sewer in rural areas – public sewer – unless it's a public health safety issue so you're going to be on septic systems. So there isn't a definition of what – that low density sprawl, but you kind of know it when you see it. It's when you start concentrating, you know, a certain amount of growth in one particular rural area where it starts to look and feel and need the services that you would typically find in a city. So the challenge that we're having, that most communities are having, is: so state laws change, and it's not saying you just have to accommodate people. It's saying we have to look more closely and say we have to look at what people can afford and try to provide the housing types that people will need of what they can afford. So if you provide only single-family detached homes and that's typically for people that make over 120% of the area median income. But if half the people need housing at below 80% of the median income the housing types you would produce, then you're going to have a mismatch. So there's really more of a focus of providing the right housing types for what people are going to need.

Commissioner Henley: It seems to be also that at some point the concept of increased jobs or available jobs, all right, would have to also be part of the equation.

Mr. White: Well, and that's why as part of this project you're also planning for the next 20 years of capacity to have jobs. The challenge is that this is a hard thing within rural areas. So, again, we're not doing a lot of planning within those urban growth areas because of the issues of not providing sewer. Cities are going to take a big challenge of taking the most of the growth. But we have to kind of ride this balance beam of providing some additional options for housing types in rural areas but it still has to be housing types that fit that rural character definition. So it still aligns with maintaining that rural visual landscape, promoting – you know, having, you know, small rural communities not leading to higher density developments that are kind of inappropriate for rural areas. So we're trying to find this balance of maybe providing some more types of – we heard from the community a lot about the desire to have more affordable housing types around rural areas where they work and live. Like they live in rural areas but their kids can't, or they can't find anything to rent. You know, they may work in the forestry industry but there's nothing to rent or there's nothing to purchase that's close to where they have to work so they have to commute a long ways.

So I think that's your biggest balance point, is we're trying to find – make sure you can accommodate, especially between 51 and 80% of the area median income. There's 501 units the county has to accommodate. Between 81 and 100%, you've got another 268 units. It's not a lot

of growth, but, like, if we just – if it was all single-family detached housing, it's just not going to hit that price point. So what do we do? I mean, this is the challenge. We've got a couple of options for you to go through. But I wanted to bring this up because this is a challenge – this is the first time Cities and Counties are going through this process of trying to meet these new state law requirements. Again, when you get these tables and you look at them you're going to see what Sedro-Woolley and Mount Vernon and Burlington have to accommodate. They're going to have to make a lot more land use changes than the County would ever have to consider because they have a much higher threshold for providing housing, especially between zero and 80% of the area median income, which is typically going to be multifamily housing. So they're going to have to have the zoning to be able to accommodate that type of growth. So that lion's share is really going on those cities. But we have the small portion to figure out: How does the County say they're accommodating housing in those categories? And so let me just kind of walk you through how we're looking at that.

So we completed a Housing Needs Assessment to kind of look at housing affordability. This is really at a high level, but just trying to draw the nexus between the types of development that would fit in different kind of area median income buckets. So you can see for a zero to 80% AMI you're typically looking at low-rise multifamily. Those \_\_\_ walkups, those three-story multifamily that you might see or condominiums. Moderate density housing can fit that 80 to 120% – townhomes, duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes. Unfortunately, that type of housing typically isn't going to hit lower price points, even on rents. It's still really expensive. I mean, I think the reason to promote more attached housing – in and of itself, it's not more affordable, but if we build *more* housing then that affects supply and demand and then hopefully that starts bringing things down. If we get more supply, I mean that can really help regulate housing prices. But in and of itself, it's not going to be affordable housing. Same with manufactured homes. Detached single-family is going to be for people making over 120% of the area median income.

Now the state's provided guidance that says that the County can count accessory dwelling units in rural areas towards that 50 to 80% AMI bucket. So if you look at that 501, you know, whether it's attached or detached ADUs, that we can count that towards that bucket. And so that's one way that we can accommodate. We can just say, you know, the County permits ADUs. We can make sure the regulations are set up correctly. But that would be one way we could do that.

So the easiest set of code changes are just kind of our structure – for us to show our work, that we've done our work, would be just to say ADUs within rural areas generally, both within those small communities like Clear Lake – When we're looking at Clear Lake and Big Lake, especially – within rural areas and those and even in resource lands, ADUs could make up that zoning. The issue is I don't really know if it really hits that price point. The state policy says it will, that we can count it towards that. So for planning purposes, I think we could check the box, but I don't know if current construction costs – I'm not sure that it really gets there. I think it's – I don't know if it's really solving the problem. And my planning approach is a little different. I don't necessarily always focus on a plan that sounds good. I want one that works well. And so this gets you to where you need to get to, I think, but it may not hit the desired results you're looking at. So, like, what other options do we have? So there *would* be an option for that 81 to 100% that we could increase housing types and/or density in the Rural Village Residential, where public facilities and services are available. I think this would be just a few small areas within Big Lake and Clear Lake.

So there were changes to the Growth Management Act a couple of years ago that provides more flexibility to accommodate housing in these Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development. Right now the densities allowed are really low. You have to show that you have the public facilities and services to serve any increases in density, but within these areas we could have an option to

allow some middle housing options like duplexes and triplexes in some of those areas. And we could also think about like allowing manufactured home parks. You know, manufactured homes are currently only allowed as a single-family residential use. So there may be some areas to provide more options. It's pretty small potatoes. We're not talking about a massive increase in densities. We're also not talking about a really huge increase in capacity. But we're trying to scour a – you have this bit of responsibility for rural areas. You have Option A, which is really like ADUs. It checks the box. We're probably there. Or two, you're digging a little deeper and saying, Hey, the community talked about wanting to provide a little bit more options for affordable housing. What are the things that you have control over and could be looking at that actually might get built too? So I know that we're going to come back to you with code that will go through these. Ultimately you'll make a recommendation and the Board will make some decisions. But these are the kind of things that we're trying to put on the table to go. What makes sense? What preserves your rural character? What fits within the lifestyles that you want? It doesn't change things too much but also, like, how do we solve some problems? So we've been kind of really running through these and trying to figure out what might make sense.

Commissioner Woodmansee: It'd be really nice for me if we could create a map that actually showed the potential areas that something like this could be done in.

Mr. White: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So just something that – okay, here's Big Lake. Here's Clear Lake. Here's a Limited deal here. Just so we can see where even the possibility of something like this new code could actually get implemented.

Mr. White: Commissioner, we can absolutely provide you that. So if we end up moving forward with some of these code options, we'll absolutely provide you the areas where we're looking at where this would be permitted and how we meet the standards under statute to allow it, and kind of give you an idea of what we're looking at. So, yes, we can absolutely provide that.

Chair Raschko: Another question, please?

Commissioner Day: I just wanted to say thank you for all of your work on this. I think these are really good options. And I just want to check to make sure that we're kind of all on the same page. So the County takes 20% allocation of the projected growth, I think. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. White: Mm-hmm. Correct.

Commissioner Day: And 80% goes to the urban areas?

Mr. White: Yes.

Commissioner Day: Okay. And so of the 20%, the negotiation has been that the County will take those housing needs that are 80% of the median income or greater, because those lend themselves more appropriately to a rural area, while the urban areas will take a higher percentage of the 80% median income and less. Is that – does that summarize it?

Mr. White: It's above 50% AMI.

Commissioner Day: 50%, okay.

Mr. White: Correct. Yes.

Commissioner Day: Okay.

Mr. White: I mean, a vast majority. You've got 2400, or almost 2500 units above 120% AMI, which is great because that's what you're probably going to see – a smaller percentage underneath. But if we did, based on Commerce guidance if we removed the under 50% AMI, which just doesn't make sense for rural areas.

Commissioner Day: Right. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. White: So we will be working with – I mean, it's been great working with Tara, Jack, and Robby and Markus and Bob and his team, just to really just kind of, like, try to brainstorm this. We'll be coming back to you with some options. Yes, ma'am?

Vice Chair Tammy Candler: I just want to clarify. Commissioner Day mentioned negotiations were what took that out, and you mentioned Commerce guidelines. Is it because of the urban growth areas' requirements for urban areas – excuse me, rural areas don't really allow for that density?

Mr. White: Correct.

Vice Chair Candler: So it's more not a negotiated thing between the Counties and the Cities, it's just following the rules.

Mr. White: Yeah. I mean – I can get into the weeds a little bit. The state provided three options for housing targets. There's a tool that's utilized to help allocate housing targets to a county and the cities. There was an Option A and an Option B that was developed. When you put in the numbers it allocated across the board, so there was originally some housing between zero to 50% AMI that was allocated to the rural areas of the county. I think there was then some feedback that said, Hey, when you figure out how affordable housing is, I mean, that's going to be multifamily housing. You can't build that in rural areas. And they said, Hey, that makes sense. Here's Option C. They didn't say you *had* to follow that, but I think it made sense to go. So we corresponded with the Cities and SCOG worked with Robby and Tara and Jack to correspond with them and said, Hey, this makes more sense, and then went back and redid the growth targets to remove those. I mean, I think it makes good sense to make sure that we're doing planning that really just makes that sense so you're not having multifamily in rural areas.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you.

Mr. White: And this is – we don't have the map showing, like, at the parcel layer. These are the areas where you're – if we look at kind of beyond just allowing accessory dwelling units, it's most likely going to be some small areas around Clear Lake and Big Lake, where there's the capital facilities and services. So we'll be narrowing this down if that happens, but we'd be making sure to limit it to those areas where we have those services available and where it makes some sense with transportation and everything else that you would need.

Okay, we've got one more little section to go through. I'm going to turn it back over to Markus. So these are preliminary development regulation changes that really – some things we've heard from the community.

Mr. Johnson: Thanks, Clay. So one of the things that have been highlighted pretty prominently in the public feedback and is kind of a top-of-mind item that we've heard is that there's – especially for farmworkers, both temporary farmworkers and year-around farmworkers. There's just not enough housing that's kind of dedicated for those farmworker houses – those farmworkers themselves. And so farmworker housing is a type of housing that many states have kind of dedicated housing that is dedicated towards farmworkers as kind of a notion and kind of a connection of just saying that these people are super important to the economy of many states and many counties and cities, and that the wages that they potentially – that the wages that they earn can sometimes be very – not sufficient enough to find housing on the general, regular private market, especially if you are a temporary worker. And so trying to find housing that supports this demographic.

And so in 2018 was the last time this kind of was studied in the county. There were only 240 dedicated permitted farmworker housing units and 461 beds for temporary workers. So that adds up to about 700 housing or sleeping units available in the county, whereas I believe also in 2018, you had around 1700 farmworker employees or jobs available working in the area. So you had a lot of people kind of having to try to find and go into the kind of general market to find housing, whether it be temporary or permanently, that work in the county.

And so this map on the righthand side is just giving some more background. You can see how the housing in the county changes from farmworker housing. So the red dots are migrant or temporary housing, and those tend to be easier to site and develop and build within the rural lands, rural areas of the county. Because they're on a smaller scale they don't have as many services that are necessary to go with them. And then you can see the year-around or permanent housing tends to happen within the cities or urban growth areas such as Mount Vernon or Sedro-Woolley, within those boundary areas there. So think about what the County could do. The proposal here would be looking at changes to add the definition of "farmworker housing" to the County's kind of listed definitions and then updating standards to allow co-living housing as an option for farmworker housing – as a type of farmworker housing that could add more sleeping units and more units available. And on the next slide I will get into the definition of "co-living" and how it – what I mean when I say "co-living."

So what is co-living housing? A short definition is just a type of housing where each resident has a small, private, lockable unit. These units can also be shared but the key things is they are small; there's a sleeping space; there's some level of privacy, and that privacy comes through being able to lock that door and kind of lock the unit to be able to protect your stuff. Residents share kitchen spaces, bathrooms, and other amenities, so they'll have kind of a shared living space, kitchen space, maybe multiple refrigerators for a large enough space, and bathrooms as well. So we kind of mentioned earlier college living before. You can think of, like, dorms as kind of a version of co-living housing. In urban settings, co-living tends to also include kitchenettes and private bathrooms and they tend to take the form of kind of a multifamily building that is then split up. So you might have a unit that is maybe split up into three bedrooms or three sleeping areas and kind of a one living space in the middle and a shared – or and then maybe private bathrooms within. This happens in urban settings. In the rural settings, these – you can think of other terms, like lodging houses or bunk houses or agricultural employee dwelling units is another term that might – you might hear from other jurisdictions around in Washington. And these are other forms of co-living housing where, again, there's usually a – you know, there's a shared and small residential place for sleeping and then there's – those rooms are private and are lockable, and then you have shared spaces in between.

I just want to differentiate. So currently in Skagit County zoning code there is a term or there is standards for co-housing, and co-housing is slightly different from co-living housing or co-living. And so co-housing is a type of residential community that is characterized by, you know, attached or detached single-family dwelling units. That's how it's defined in Skagit County. So you could think about this is like cottages. Cottage housing is kind of a type of co-housing but it's basically when a group of people kind of come together to develop property shared together where maybe all of the families that do this development together have individual places where they live – detached homes where they live, but they might have shared dining spaces or shared kitchen spaces where they might do group meals together, or kind of large recreational facilities – libraries or child care buildings that are kind of centrally located for that.

So that is different from co-living and co-housing so far – yeah. The regulations underneath the county right now are – they have a limited density, they're at one dwelling unit per 40 acres right now in the rural areas for co-housing. And so co-living would have a different approach – maybe not be as available in kind of the larger agricultural zones or rural zones, but maybe in the Limited Areas of More Intense Development – so LAMIRDs – and kind of areas that are potentially closer to some of the urban settings as well.

Commissioner Henley: Question?

Mr. Johnson: Yes?

Commissioner Henley: I think it's one thing to change the laws, the codes – all right? – to accommodate increased farmworker housing. Right now what we have is roughly 700-something beds being chased by a little bit more than 1700 jobs. And that's a pretty big difference. So my question is: What incentive do the farmers have to provide farmworker housing? And it seems to me that unless we structure it in such a way that they get an economic benefit – all right? – we're always going to have this gap where you've got more than twice as many jobs seeking half as many beds.

Mr. White: Yeah, I mean that's a great question. That may be something that we need to be looking at. As Markus kind of showed you, there's some of the housing that's being built in cities, so one way would be making sure that we have policies to be working at the regional level to provide enough housing supply at the regional – so it's supplied in cities that serve, how do the cities know what's needed within the county? So there could be that increased coordination. But you're right. For a lot of different housing types, the market may not build it unless there's the incentives to actually do it. Markus, I'm not sure what's in the code right now or if – maybe that's something that we could be looking at as, you know, what would be some incentives to be able to allow it. In rural areas, it would be probably allowing to do it; minimizing regulations – minimizing regulations especially for temporary. Probably minimizing regulations that would typically apply to fulltime housing. It's so costly to build per unit that it may not get built, so it'd be allowing temporary units, manufactured housing, some other things that would be there. I don't know. Markus, do you have any other thoughts?

Commissioner Henley: You can see the problem, right?

Mr. White: Absolutely! Yep, yep. I mean, I wouldn't isolate this to this type of housing. I'd say this is a problem for lots of types of housing \_\_\_\_\_.

Commissioner Henley: Of course. But, you know, since we're basically an agricultural county, okay, it becomes a little bit more important.

Mr. White: Yep, you're right. Well, I appreciate those comments. We can certainly be looking and seeing what those incentives could be. Markus, did you have any thoughts on that?

Mr. Johnson: Oh, yeah. I think – like you said, I think we would definitely be looking at kind of an incentives structure and how you could do that, I think. Just making co-living – maybe some of these changes and just making it allowed and kind of, as you said, making it easier and maybe some of the incentives are just allowing, you know, more of these AEDUs, or the agriculture employee dwelling units is kind of an example of kind of, you know, allowing these really small kind of housing units that are maybe – you know, it might not be worth it to do one or two of them but it might be worth to do, you know, depending on how large your farm is, three or four of them type of thing.

Mr. White: Yeah, it's hard because it's not – the County has control over certain things and not over others. It controls permit process, fee structures, and requirements to build it from a \_\_\_ regulated \_\_\_ the code. We can certainly take a look and work with the County to see if there's some incentive options that we can provide that may work.

Commissioner Henley: It'd be nice to find some way to induce additional construction of, you know, farmworker housing – all right? – to show it as a benefit for farmers.

Commissioner Knight: That's terrific.

Commissioner Henley: I mean, farmers are working pretty close to the bone these days, so I think the best we can do for them would be to give them some benefit.

Mr. White: I love that. Yeah. We will come back to you with some options.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead.

Commissioner Hutchison: So \_\_\_\_\_ the co-living. I mean, my understanding of them is that basically any single-family home can become one if you just get locks on the doors. But in theory, now it's become a multifamily unit and it's considered commercial. So now you have all of these requirements for fire safety and like getting in sprinklers and, I mean, what's to stop somebody just from – I don't know. I just – it seems like there's *such* a huge expense to – going the route of officially naming it “co-living housing” rather than just having separate keys on private bedroom doors for folks in a regular home. I don't know. I'm not sure what I'm looking for. I just – I'm a little confused.

Mr. White: In fact, I don't even know if you have – I mean, there's a difference between using a home as a rental. But I mean, there are some requirements that if you're changing the occupancy of a structure that the County has to regulate it \_\_\_\_\_.

Director Jack Moore: Sure, yeah. This is not common, as you point out, Commissioner. You know, typically most of the time around here it's the renters that get together and decide on a roommate situation and may do that. At least in my mind there are other ways of shared living. There are certain housing units, I know, at least in Mount Vernon, that are co-living and they're set up that way, and the owner of the building is the one that rents out each room individually with a descriptor of how that works. The building code does have exception for – I don't recall the exact threshold but a small number of people living as a family unit, wherein you don't have to have all of what you would typically need for a shared housing apartment building. So there's



congregate living residences listed in the building code and it's up to several people living together, maybe a dozen at the most.

Mr. White: But you're right. There are some things where you trip a threshold and then you get into fire, life, safety, and then you get into ADA and then you get in all of these different things that can inhibit converting existing single-family homes to be used for those purposes. We could probably do a little bit of research and just kind of give you some information about what that – those thresholds are. Because we don't want to *disincentivize* things that we're trying to promote. But sometimes there *are* barriers and you've just got to figure out what are the things that you control that you actually could regulate and then what are the things that you're trying to figure out under building codes as well – and ensuring there's fire, life, safety and all the things that we want to have in structures if they're used for those purposes.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Wright?

Commissioner Wright: Just a follow-up. As if this goes forward and I have a timeline and there's definitely a need, how is it communicated when we're codifying all of this and creating opportunities incentivizing it? How do we communicate back to the public that they can do this? I'm not sure where this will live. \_\_\_\_\_ us in our inboxes and on our websites, but how do the people who need access to these changes to build these things learn about this? Or am I just not knowing how we reach out to the farming community and the farmworkers that we have opportunities that might come down the line?

Mr. White: Then I'd say you're pretty keyed in with the agricultural and building communities, so I think that if you're doing something that helps either one of those communities they're going to know about it pretty quickly.

Director Moore: Definitely. So I meet minimum monthly with the Agricultural Advisory Board. They have, you know, connections in all part of the ag community. I also talk regularly with Wayne Crider from Skagit/Island County Builders Association, which is the largest builders group around. So there are ways we could do that. In addition to, you know, website postings in the office, et cetera, for our customers to start getting the word out. So different ways. We can do press releases.

Commissioner Knight: \_\_\_\_\_. I like \_\_\_\_\_. But budgetwise, spending \_\_\_ preparing. It's good to know. So these are options coming down the line six, eight months. I don't feel like \_\_\_ be blindsided like it's a need. Do it now where we can do and prepare for, is kind of my lens. So thank you.

Mr. White: Yeah, and they will also be – I mean, their stakeholders is part of this process too, so as we're – hopefully, as we're developing code it will go out that we get good feedback that, you know, of how they see it actually getting implemented and how we could make sure that we develop code that doesn't just sound good: it works well.

I think we had one more slide there for you, Markus.

Mr. Johnson: All right. And yeah, I think this kind of is meant to be abutted on the conversation in terms of a little bit of what Clay was talking about earlier – in terms of thinking about the future and what the kind of urban growth areas might look like. And, you know, farmworker housing in the UGAs can look a lot different – looks a lot different than it does in kind of the rural areas or the rural capacity of those. And so on the lefthand side are just some examples from Woodburn,

Oregon, from an organization, the Farmworker Housing Development Corporation in Oregon, that helps and kind of organizes and develops farmworker housing. And so you can see, you know, when you're in the urban growth areas how these things can change from, you know, a three-story, kind of multifamily building with public arts and centered around kind of a playground area in the center for kids, or it can be kind of a townhome kind of neighborhood collection with small streets and – or kind of public right-of-ways (sic) and walking areas for people to kind of walk through and bump into their neighbors, versus what it might look like on the rural side in capacity-wise, which can still be helpful, can still provide sleeping units and housing units for both specifically for temporary workers that are coming in for peak agricultural production time. And so you have on the righthand side kind of these one-story buildings, manufactured type of structures that can be moved around, are temporary, and easy for people to kind of, you know, rent cheaply essentially during their timeframe.

And I just want to add some other thoughts to the discussion beforehand in terms of where the parameters could come from. And so you can do things like set the maximum, you know, living spaces and not going too high on the maximum living space so you're – you know, you're straying away and you're trying to make sure that it is exactly a small kind of shared use sleeping unit versus getting towards and creeping towards kind of a studio apartment type of thing, which would trigger some other multifamily or building code issues that were mentioned before. So this is the range of the kind of farmworker housing between UGA and rural capacity, and thinking about the future you can both plan for and try to help promote development of both types, both in the kind of rural areas and how to plan for it in the UGA areas as well.

Mr. White: Great. Thank you, Markus. Well, we appreciate the opportunity just to come and just to have an initial conversation with you about some of the things that we'll be looking at as part of the update. We'll be back. We're also going to be talking about any changes that would come out of the new policies with the Climate Element. We'll also be coming and talking to you about the critical areas ordinance as well when those regulations are ready to go. I know Tara's going to talk to you the schedule, but just to make sure we've been working hard with them to kind of take our schedule that we've had for the whole project and then we're going to get into the next six, seven, eight months of work and really pencil in, When are we having Planning Commission meetings and hearings and comment periods? There's a lot to make sure. If we're going to be at this Planning Commission meeting, that means we have to have this amount of work done and get all these things done. So, you know, right now we're looking at having, you know, four more briefings for the Planning Commission and five for the Board of County Commissioners. We're going to have three different public comment periods. And then meetings starting in February, where we're going to go into in-depth briefings about the draft Comprehensive Plan and comments that we receive before you have your public hearings. So we can walk you through everything that's in there. You can ask questions. We can make adjustments. And then we can get recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners. And then we'll do the same thing with the development regulations. So we're not going to have one hearing or one briefing on the whole thing. We're going to try to take it in chunks. So you'll have plenty of opportunity to receive information as well as the public, review it, ask questions, revisions. And so we want you to be able to have the time to be able to make quality recommendations to the Board.

So I'll probably turn it over to Tara here in a second, but I just – if you have any final questions. If you have anything that pops in your head after briefings, too, pass those on. We want to make sure that we're bringing back a code that's responsive to the things that you would like to see and just some of the ideas that we've heard so far are great and we'll take those back and we will bring you back maps and look at some incentives for farmworker housing and other things as well.

That's all I have tonight.

Chair Raschko: Did anybody have any further questions?

Mr. White: We'll see you after the new year.

Chair Raschko: Well, thank you very much. And thank you, Mr. Johnson. Anything else, Tara?

Ms. Satushek: No. Thank you, Clay. Thank you, Markus.

So we did print out the Planning Commission schedule for next year – via email and it's also in your packet. Like Clay had mentioned, there's two meetings in February that are going to be in-depth over the draft plan, starting with existing conditions and then we will present the Vulnerability Assessment tied to the Resilience Sub-Element required in the Climate Element. We will also present the community engagement summary to-date. So we will present the feedback from the October open houses, the October survey that we had with climate, and then the public comments received for the draft elements to-date. Yeah, so we have had – all the draft first revision draft elements go out, and the last one that had the public comment period close was in late October for the Climate and Environment Draft Elements. And then moving on, we are planning to do a joint – our joint meeting with the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners on – in February 25<sup>th</sup>. It happens every year. This one will obviously be focused on the Comprehensive Plan and just sharing your discussion with the Commissioners. And then we will move into public hearing and deliberations for the Comprehensive Plan itself over three days in March, so back to the Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, with the public hearing and then the public hearing continued if needed, or deliberations for that next day. And then deliberations if needed. So three days if needed. We can obviously cancel one of those if work is completed before then.

And then we move into the critical areas ordinance and development regulations public hearings and briefings staggered over between April and May. And then we will continue our work once we have a lot of this fleshed out. We'll be able to set concrete dates with the Board of County Commissioners to schedule public hearings and deliberations.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Any questions on the schedule?

Vice Chair Candler: I do have a question. So your intention is for us to do public hearing in March. This is not the Commissioners; this is us?

Ms. Satushek: Correct.

Vice Chair Candler: So we've never done that, I don't think before – three nights in a row. That's new. I don't know about that.

Ms. Satushek: That was recommended because of the scope of this project and with the consultant team trying to get everything done together, and also with timing constraints. We kind of went back and forth with the consultant team and our department and the Board just to see what would work, so this was the recommended approach. But, again, whatever – we could address needs as they come up.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: Thanks.

Chair Raschko: Anything else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Ms. Satushek: I do. Oh, I apologize.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. We'll turn then to Department Updates.

Ms. Satushek: So I didn't expect Jack to be here so I told him I'd hop on. I'm glad he's here. So starting in January we're going to transition to Action Meeting Minutes, which will – there was a memo provided just kind of summarizing what those are. It captures the motions and the final actions. So that will be the total record with the video recording. Because right now these meetings are being recorded three ways. There're transcription, minutes, and recording. So we're trying to consolidate and most use the Department's resources efficiently. This also is recommended by the Open Public Meetings – it aligns with the Open Public Meetings Act and is recommended by most jurisdictions, by MRSC – I forget what that stands for but it's the Municipal Research nonprofit that advises local jurisdictions on regulations and how best to administer them.

And then on January 14<sup>th</sup> will be nominations and elections of the Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair. That's what I have.

Chair Raschko: Okay, any questions for staff?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All right. We'll go to Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements. So, Jen, what have you tonight?

Commissioner Hutchison: Nothing this evening. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Kiera?

Commissioner Knight: Nothing, other than Happy Holidays. Merry Christmas, Happy New Year.

Chair Raschko: Joe?

Commissioner Woodmansee: The same – Happy Holidays, Merry Christmas, Happy New Year. All those good things.

Chair Raschko: Vince?

Commissioner Henley: Merry Christmas to everyone.

Chair Raschko: Same from you?

Vice Chair Candler: Same Merry Christmas. I'm still trying to process how I feel about meeting three nights in a row. I would like to know if anybody else has any thoughts about that because that's just not something we've ever done before.

But otherwise, yeah, this will be our last meeting, I guess, before the holidays so I wish everyone a great time.

Chair Raschko: Angela?

Commissioner Day: I have nothing to add.

Chair Raschko: Okay. I see that nothing can be done about it, but I don't like the three meetings in a row anymore. And if anybody could just be patient for a moment: When we went through the Climate Element, I was a little dissatisfied with how forest management was treated as far as sequestration and particularly with the Commerce Department's summary. So I spent some time and I found some verbiage for everybody's consideration for might be included there. I'll just – please don't read it now. It's just something to do over the holidays. But I would appreciate at least some thought being given to –

Commissioner Henley: I'll give it to the AI and see what it does.

Chair Raschko: All right. And I have a bunch for staff as well here. I'll give you that going out the door. So I just want to wish everybody a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, and blessings and all of that. So thank you and the meeting's adjourned (gavel).