

**Skagit County Planning Commission
Public Hearing: 2012 CPAs
Deliberations: 2014-2019 CFP
November 5, 2013**

Commissioners: Annie Lohman, Chair
Josh Axthelm, Vice Chair
Jason Easton
Keith Greenwood
Matt Mahaffie
Elinor Nakis
Kevin Meenaghan
Robert Temples
Dave Hughes (absent)

Staff: Gary Christensen, Planning Manager
Kirk Johnson, Senior Planner
Brian Adams, Parks Director
Ryan Walters, Civil Deputy
Kaci Radcliffe, Facilities Coordinator
Jan Flagan, Public Works Surface Water Manager

Public Commenters: Carol Ehlers
Ed Stauffer

Public Hearing Commenters:

Parks and Recreation Plan Update
Randy Good
Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County
Liz McNett Crowl
Martha Bray, Skagit Land Trust
Carol Ehlers
Jeroldine Hallberg
Ed Stauffer
Ellen Cooley
Marie Erbstoesz

Del Mar Community Service Rezone
Roger Noar
Carol Ehlers
Ed Stauffer

Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan
Tim Rosenhan

Terica Taylor, Economic Development Association of Skagit County
Mike O'Donnell
Roger Howard, Burlington-Edison School Board
Mike Anderson, Mayor of Sedro-Woolley
Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County
Carol Ehlers
Jon Sitkin, Attorney for Property Owner John Bouslog
Patsy Martin, Port of Skagit
Ellen Cooley

Others: **Patrik Dylan, Consultant, Eccos Design**
John Semrau, Parks Advisory Board

Chair Annie Lohman: (gavel) Okay, I call to order the meeting of the Planning Commission for November 5th, 2013. The first order of business is to review the agenda. Are there any changes or deletions to the agenda from the Planning Commission?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Seeing none, we'll move right into the second order of business which is Public Remarks. Is there anybody from the public that would like to make public remarks? This is separate from the public hearing. Carol?

Carol Ehlers: Carol Ehlers, West Fidalgo Island. I gave this document to the Planning Commission last time there was a hearing and I thought I would share it with the rest of you because it shows a significant difference in Skagit County population over whatever has been before. This is from the Northwest Regional Council on Aging and so its focus is on the group that is sixty or older. And according to this, in Skagit County (in) 1990 we had 16,235; in 2000 we had 19,271, which isn't much of an increase; but in 2010 we had 26,615, which turns out to be 23% of the population of this county. Now nationally they expect the population to go to 24% sometime in 2090 or 2095. So as has happened before in Skagit County we're ahead of the coin, so there's no role model to think about. But I remember when years ago when we were doing the North Cascades Park I asked that there be a north cross highway going through the American Alps so that people who could not drive – could not hike the way we were doing or could no longer hike, for whatever reason, would still have the opportunity to see some of the most beautiful scenery in the entire United States. And that was one of the reasons why the North Cross Highway was built. There are economic reasons too, but it was the thought of the what-happens-to-you-when-you-get-old. Now here I am and I find there's a different attitude. Affordable housing when you're

young is, Can I buy it? Can I rent it? Affordable housing when you're my age is, Can I sell it for what I need to have to take care of myself? It's an entirely different way of looking at things. So I would encourage you to consider that in the next number of years as you plan and make decisions. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. Anybody else for Public Remarks?

Ed Stauffer: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Ed Stauffer, P.O. Box 114, Bow. I appreciate the opportunity to make a brief remark, even though I know this is not on the record. The last time I addressed you was at your last meeting and I quoted the Preamble of the state Constitution. I'd like to bring that a little closer to home. This morning I attended a celebration honoring the quarter century of service of Planning Commissioner Emeritus Carol Ehlers, and Commissioner Dillon chairing the proceedings made the remark that she viewed the Planning Commission as the eyes and ears of the Board of County Commissioners. So I'm glad you're listening, I'm glad that you're hearing, and I'm glad that you're passing it along. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Anybody else? Final call – anybody else for Public Remarks?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Okay, seeing none we'll move on to the next item on the agenda which is the public hearing of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendments. We're going to begin with the staff. They'll introduce the Comp Plan Amendments, and then following their presentation we'll receive public testimony.

So I'm going to read a statement: The purpose of this public hearing is to receive public testimony and written correspondence regarding proposals to amend the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan and Land Use and Zoning Map. The order of the public hearings is as follows:

One, proposal to amend Skagit County Comprehensive Plan to incorporate by reference the 2012 Skagit County Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan.

Item number 2, proposal to redesignate and rezone P118792, an approximately .3-acre parcel owned by Del Mar Community Service on which are located two water tanks, from Rural Resource-NRL to Rural Reserve.

Three, proposal to redesignate and rezone four parcels, P74450, P103560, P103559 and P74451, 1.5 acres in size, to Rural Business.

The fourth proposal is to amend the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan.

For each proposal there are separate sign-up sheets in the back of the room for those who want to testify. And they're back there where Kirk is. An opportunity will be given at the end of the hearing for those that wish to testify but did not sign up to speak.

Please limit your comments to three minutes so that everyone will have a chance to speak. Special interest groups, associations, or those representing others are encouraged to designate one spokesperson for your group to allow greater participation and cross representation.

Please use this time to make your main points.

Before you testify, clearly state your name, spelling your last name, and your address. A recording system will record your comments. Written comments are also being accepted and can be placed at the box located on the staff table near the front of the room, right next to Mr. Walters. The written comment period on each proposal is open until Thursday, November 7th, at 4:30 p.m.

Before we begin taking public comments, staff will give a brief presentation. And thank you for taking the time to participate. Gary, you're on.

Gary Christensen: Thank you, Chair Lohman. Gary Christensen, Skagit County Planning and Development Services. Welcome, Planning Commission members and those in attendance this evening.

I'm going to be reading from a staff report which has been posted on the County website for some time, and copies of which have also been provided to the Planning Commission. I'm not going to be reading it verbatim. I'm going to try to summarize and cover the most important parts and with my intention to save a majority of the time for you, the public, to be able to offer comments and testimony tonight.

But let me provide you with a little bit of background and what the next steps are. On April 9th of this year the Skagit County Board of Commissioners held a public hearing on the 2012 annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment docket proposals and deliberated on such July 9th of this year. On July 15th of this year a resolution, R20130179, the Skagit County Commissioners established the 2012 Comprehensive Plan docket with supplemental findings. This evening the Skagit County Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on those proposed amendments to the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Zoning Map that are being considered as part of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendment docket.

A staff report has been prepared which includes an analysis of the various proposals and their consistency with County and State requirements, and the Department's recommendations on each, as required by Skagit County Code

14.08.080. The Department's recommendations are based on the proposal's application materials, additional research conducted by the Department, and an evaluation of the map amendments' consistency with relevant designation policies and criteria and the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan, and provisions in Skagit County Code relating to land use designations.

On November 12th, a week from today, the Planning Commission will hold a public meeting to deliberate on the merits of each of the proposals and will later forward a set of recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners regarding the proposed amendments.

Finally, on dates to be determined, the Board of County Commissioners will hold their own public meeting or meetings to consider and take official action on the proposed Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Zoning Map Amendments. We do expect the Board of County Commissioners to take this matter up before the end of the year.

Now let me briefly provide you with a summary of the proposals which are before the Planning Commission tonight and for which you will be providing public testimony. There are four County-initiated proposals which are being considered, two of which include amendments to the Skagit County Comprehensive Land Use and Zoning Maps; one amendment to incorporate by reference the 2012 Skagit County Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan; and one to amend the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan. Each of these proposals will have their own public hearing and which then they will be closed. The comment period will remain open. But we'll dispose of these proposals one at a time.

The first of which is a proposal to amend Skagit County Comprehensive Plan to incorporate by reference the 2012 Skagit County Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan. The Skagit County Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan is a subset of the County's regional Comprehensive Plan. The Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan is defined as a functional plan whose purpose is to focus on specific regional governmental services and/or utilities such as water, waste water, transportation or housing. Functional plans can be programmatic or operational, which means they guide daily management decisions or include the specific details of facility, design and location. That's found at Skagit County Comprehensive Plan page 1.10. Functional plans must be consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan and must serve to implement its goals, its policies and programs.

This proposal is to – quote – “incorporate by reference” – end quote – the Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan into the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan. The Parks and Recreation Plan will not become a chapter in the Comprehensive Plan but will remain a separate, functional planning document. Now there's been some confusion as to what “incorporate by reference” means.

A simple definition of “incorporate by reference” is to include language from another document or elsewhere into a document by reference rather than repeating it. So rather than have this – I’m going to say – several hundred-page document be a chapter in the Comprehensive Plan it is simple incorporated by reference.

On February 27th of last year by Resolution R20120057 the Skagit County Board of Commissioners adopted the 2012 Skagit County Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan. The 2012 Skagit County Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan update relied on four public meetings in 2011, a 2011 level of service, or LOS, analysis which measured the amount of public facilities that are provided to the community relative to the population size and in comparison to other counties. It also included a 2011 online public opinion survey to elicit public input on current and future Parks and Recreation recommendations, and also included the review and recommendations of a citizen-based Skagit County Parks and Recreation Advisory Board.

The staff report includes the Plan’s executive summary, which I’m not going to read this evening, and addresses several public comments on themes which were raised at the previous docketing hearing before the Board of County Commissioners.

The recommendation of the Department: Based on the aforementioned analysis, the Department concludes that the Skagit County Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan be approved subject to those recommendations of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board as shown in Appendix A to this staff report. As to its consistency, the 2012 Skagit County Parks and Recreation Plan is consistent with those provisions of the Growth Management Act cited at RCW 36.70A.070(8) and the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan. That is the extent of the Department’s report.

I believe we have Brian Adams in attendance this evening, who is the Skagit County Parks and Recreation Director, and some others who will be joining him in a brief presentation.

Brian Adams: Thank you. Thank you, staff, and thank you, Planning Commission, for being here tonight. I had the privilege of serving on the Planning Commission back in the early ‘90s so I know how much you have to work and how arduous your job can be, so thank you for being here tonight on election night.

Before you today is the document, our Parks Plan document. The first Plan was developed in the 1970s – probably 1972. I think there was the process of putting together five parks at that time. Some of you might recognize the County Commissioners and some of the people that were on the Parks Board at that time. But it’s the Skagit County Comprehensive Park Plan, which is similar to the

title that we have today. And then since that time we had a '98 Plan. We probably had a couple of plans before then. I don't have copies of those in my office but I'm sure they're around. And then the 2004 plan that's here. The '98 Plan really put together the template for what we have in the 2012 Plan today. So kind of the chapters are similar, kind of the themes are similar.

The Parks and Rec Board, as Gary said, worked through 2011. I think that we had ten meetings at that time – Parks Advisory Board meetings – and then we've had a couple since then, so it's been through a long process. John Semrau is here. He's the Chair of the Board. And Patrik Dylan's with me. Patrick helped put together the Plan as well. He is with a firm called Eccos Design and he spent six years as a Project Planner for Skagit County Parks many years ago. So he has some familiarity with the Department, has a lot of familiarity with parks – with, you know, the trade, I guess, in general. So thank you for being here with me tonight.

Our Parks Board, I just want to say, was very instrumental in putting this thing together and I know it's very arduous on them as well, so I really appreciate all the time and effort that they've put into it. I really want to let John talk tonight so I'm going to kind of limit myself here, and then Patrik's going to say a little bit about the process as well. Liz McNett Crowl – I see that she's here tonight; she's a Parks Board member as well – put in a lot of time. She's got a strong interest in just making sure that there's safe passage across the county for travelers, whether they're – non-motorized primarily. Thank you for being here tonight, Liz.

John has been with the Board for twenty-five years and so he's got a lot of history, a lot of institutional knowledge and we lean on him a lot.

Patrik, do you want to talk a little bit about the process?

Patrick Dylan: Sure. Thank you, Brian. Again, my name is Patrik Dylan. I'm with Eccos Design. We're a landscape architecture firm in Mount Vernon at 505 South First Street.

So one of the main purposes of this Plan is the chance for the Parks and Recreation Department to interface with the public and the community and ask what they're looking for in terms of parks and recreation. So we tried to make this as much of a grass roots process as possible by talking with the folks directly in as many instances and as many ways as possible. One of the main ways we did that was with open houses where we had meetings across the county to talk to people. We had a public opinion survey where folks could log onto a computer and tell us some of the things that they're interested in. And then we relied, as Brian said before, heavily on the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board to interact with the constituents on a daily basis to help us understand what folks were saying.

So to briefly summarize our public input, our first effort was a series of four public meetings that took place across the county in the community of Rockport, Clear Lake, Mount Vernon and Anacortes. We tried to spread it out as much as possible. In addition, after those meetings were concluded we conducted a month-long public survey where folks got a chance to log on and do a questionnaire and tell us some of the things that were important to them, some of the things they liked, some of the things they'd like to see different. And then finally the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board had ten working meetings where they had a chance to review chapters two at a time and actually not just review a ___ that was given to them but actually write the information that was in there and actually create the chapters in a way that made sense to them based upon what they were hearing. Those were all public meetings as well.

But beyond what people were telling us in terms of what their desires are, what they wanted, we wanted to make sure we looked at what some of the recreational *needs* were, because needs and desires are not necessarily the same thing. So we spent a fair amount of time looking at something called the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, or SCORP document. This is a document that the state of Washington puts together approximately every five years where they go through a series of interviews and a series of surveys and try to analyze the different trends in recreation on a regional basis. All of those surveys and all those interviews are statistically valid and it's a very comprehensive document that looks at recreational trends as well as demographics. The information that Carol highlighted earlier in terms of different population subsets, all those different population subsets are looked at, too, in terms of their recreational trends.

In the final analysis the tool that we used was something that Gary referenced and that's the level of service, and that's where we look at how much of a certain park type is available in Skagit County and we compare that to other communities that are similar to us, so the counties to the north and south as well as other comparable communities.

So outside of planning another real purpose of this document is that it's required by the Washington State Recreation Conservation Office, or the RCO, in order for Skagit County to be eligible for grants to help with the acquisition and development of park projects. You may be familiar with the Northern State Recreation Area, Skagit Valley Playfields, the Swinomish Channel Boat Launch, a recent acquisition at Sharpe Park in Anacortes. All of those parks had dollars that were used from the RCO to help with their either acquisition or development. In fact, the vast majority of the parks in Skagit County more so than not have RCO dollars in their funding, so that's really a critical component to the Parks Department's ability to manage and develop their park facilities.

So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to John who's going to speak for a few minutes about the Parks and Rec Advisory Board and their role as well. Thank you.

John Semrau: I'm John Semrau. I reside in Mount Vernon. Americans place high value on recreation opportunities. Many consider recreation lands and services to be central to the quality of lives and the livability of our communities. That's the first two sentences in our 1998 Comp Plan. I think the first Plan I worked on was 1987 so I've seen a few of the processes. In addition to the work we did specifically with the public meetings that were held for the Comp Plan, like yourselves we hold ten meetings a year where we take public comment at the start of our meeting on any topic that's not on the agenda. We also hold – we also allow the public to participate in most of our agenda items if they're there specifically for that. For an advisory board, we're always open to public comment. We also are more of a consensus board. We prefer to make decisions after all the members have participated, whether it's through e-mail or other things, before we make a lot of our decisions.

You know, many of us think the Skagit Valley's the greatest place in the world. This Comp Plan before you is – really it's a Comp Plan of opportunities. We've been able to use this tool – I mean, it's a collection of all of our resources – not just the County's: the state's, Fish and Wildlife, the cities. It's the tool we use to *not* miss any opportunities whether it's a (sic) access point to a beach on Samish Bay that we were able to quickly be able to secure that opportunity for the public. But missed opportunities if we're going to lose a boat launch or for any kind of public access. This is really a plan about providing opportunities for the people in Skagit County.

I did just take a few minutes to try – and I hope I don't forget anybody here. I did try to just quickly list some of the partners we've had over the years. Almost every project we've had – new park acquisition, new access point – whether it's an easement or something else that we've participated in. And these are not in any particular order although I did put the Skagit Land Trust at the top because we have had some tremendous project opportunities with them. We've also worked with San Juan Preservation Trust; the Nature Conservancy; the Forest Service in several areas on our Skagit River corridor; the state parks; Department of Fish and Wildlife; Mount Vernon; Burlington; Anacortes; La Conner; also the – I'm blanking on the pioneer group that has the park by the bridge – we partnered with them at one point; Sedro-Woolley; Whatcom County – we have joint park work use with them; Puget Sound Energy; Seattle City Light; Skagit Fisheries Enhancement group; the Upper Skagit Tribe; other area tribes; the DNR; and the Port of Skagit.

Mr. Adams: And the dike district.

Mr. Semrau: And the dike district – Dike District 12. It started out as Dike District 8. But we've had – we've been able to – through our Comp Plan process – to provide the tools that we've needed to get the grants, partnerships, the funding. It's also a great resource for us as a parks board and just dealing with, you know, what we're managing, and I think it's a real good tool for the community as to what we do have to offer.

Mr. Adams: John, thank you. And I just wanted to say – remind – it *is* an update. The information that's really changed in the latest document is primarily the Department physical changes, including staffing changes, park acquisitions, demographic information – thank you, Carol, for giving us some new information there – amenity modifications, and just updated project goals based on evolving recreational trends.

We received a few comments during the docketing process, and although we don't want to set a precedent necessarily for making further document adjustments after a long and arduous public process, we have recommended small modifications to part of this signed document from information that came in to us. We crafted a staff response to some of the themes, responded to some of those themes, made a couple of modifications. Those can be found in the staff report. The Plan was deliberated on and voted on by Parks Board members after two years of Advisory Board meetings – ten in that time period. And then we had a unanimous vote. I've got a – I'd like to, you know, introduce that also to you, Gary, with the information that was signed as far as – I think eight Parks Board members that we had on board. We had a position open at that time, but that was signed. All right?

And we'll open it up for those that want to speak. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: So I'd like to remind the public to limit yourself to three minutes and make sure that you clearly state your name, spelling your last name, and give your address. So on the Parks Plan the first person I have is Randy Good, followed by Ellen Bynum.

Randy Good: Good evening. Randy Good, G-o-o-d, 35482 State Route 20, Sedro-Woolley. After hearing – some comments were made and we did – the Parks Board did make a few changes that I recommended, and then after reviewing this document further I have some more concerns about it, so that's what I really wanted to address here.

We actually encourage the Planning Commission to recommend that this Park and Rec Plan be brought back and reviewed by the Planning Commission. With the over-fifty age group rapidly growing, with the park survey clearly showing needs for indoor facilities that we don't have, why the need for more trails? Questions have been raised: Is there a need for Chapter 5? And that's called "Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation." On page 5-11 of that, it says Trends

and Concerns, quote – and so this is a quote: “Agricultural cultivation of these and former open lowlands has reduced species diversity, as has forest management in current and former wooded areas.” End quote. Our concern is again just opinions and assumptions here – no science to back up these accusations, so really is there a need for Chapter 5 in this Parks and Rec Plan? Many other government agencies, non-profits, tribes, private are competing for these same grant monies. As we know, all grants have strings attached which are detrimental to recreation and to agriculture.

The Park and Rec Plan fails to address legal public process requirements, and property rights I think needs to be added into this Plan. And an example is the lack of legal public process on the Cascade Trail. No public process as required by the Skagit County Comp Plan policy, and actually funds from 102 are for non-motorized projects only, and these were the funds that were used.

The public’s first knowledge of this paving project was April 29, 2013, on the County Commissioners’ Consent Agenda. Input to this specific project was a few letters solicited by one or two trail promoters representing one civic group and given to the Parks Department, with most letters cc’d back to this individual. The letter from the Sedro-Woolley School District was never considered or approved by the Sedro-Woolley School District Board. Was the circumventing of the public process by the Parks Department, County Commissioners and County Administrator used to get around SEPA environmental review? Good question. Is this the Skagit County staff’s pathetic attempt to claim that a legal public process was followed?

Chair Annie Lohman: Randy, your time has expired. Sorry.

Mr. Good: Okay, then I’ll hand out a copy to each one of the Planning Commission members. Thanks.

Chair Lohman: Ellen Bynum, followed by Liz McNett Crowl.

Ellen Bynum: Good evening. Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County. Last name B-y-n-u-m and 110 South First Street, Mount Vernon.

I wanted to first address the accessibility of the Parks Plan to the public. I didn’t have a copy – printed copy – of the Parks Plan and I quite like looking at printed copies. So wanting to, you know, print that out it took two hours on a home printer to print it out. So I don’t know if that is something that most people would endure or do, and I don’t know how you need to address the availability. I think in the past you – Brian probably had printed copies made available to the public and I think we don’t do that as much now. So that’s just a side comment.

The main concern that I have about the Plan is that I understand that you have certain requirements by the RCO or any other grantors that give you – that tell

you things that they would like you to do. And one of those things has to do with continuity with GMA and planning and capital facilities. So often a parks plan or a drainage plan or a transportation plan has to be coordinated and mentioned in as being adopted before a granting agency will consider it for funding. And I'm not saying that you shouldn't have that but I do question the continued use of the suggestions in the templates that are given by the state agencies. I don't know that they're always appropriate. If they're not a legal requirement I would request that, you know, this be rethought and rewritten in a different way.

Because basically what has happened with this Plan is you have morphed – the Parks Department has morphed from a parks and recreation department into a conservation group. And my question is that, you know, it's okay to say you want to do those things within your park, but what is it going to be – what is it going to cost the public? Do you have the expertise on your staff to do this? No, so you're probably going to be going out hiring consultants. And while this is a great idea for a jobs program and it's one of the reasons that we get grants to hire consultants to keep the economy going, this is not exactly what we had in mind for Parks and Rec. So while you would like to be able to put that information into your Plan so that the RCO would be able to consider you for habitat conservation projects that they might have in mind, I question whether the public even knows that that was added, and I would like to ask Patrik if there was any interface in the public – opportunities for the public to comment that describe the change in programming that you were proposing for habitat. Because I don't think people understand what that means. That's a totally separate animal to what you are doing in providing recreation. Now I might have read the Plan wrong but that's how I read it, and that's of concern.

Okay, so –

Josh Axthelm: Ellen, your time's up.

Ms. Bynum: Sure. I will provide additional comments, and I just want the Planning Commission to consider, you know Is it appropriate to approve a plan where the function of an agency has been changed without very much public comment? Thanks.

Chair Lohman: Okay, Liz McNett Crowl, followed by Martha Bray.

Liz McNett Crowl: Good evening. Liz McNett Crowl. McNett, M-c-n-e-t-t. Crowl, C-r-o-w-l, 13797 Trumpeter Lane, Mount Vernon, Washington. I am a Skagit County Parks and Recreation Advisory Board member and this is the third time I've had an opportunity to participate in a Comprehensive Plan update. I'm just here tonight to speak in favor of the Plan moving forward, and that I really appreciated the thoroughness of the process that the Parks Board went through and the opportunity for the Parks Board to be as involved as they were in this update, as well as the last updates.

I think that sometimes we overlook the role of Parks and Recreation and what they really bring to our community. It's not only recreation and an opportunity to enjoy these public properties but it also helps us maintain our health, and the health of the public is very important. And we know that by having public access to Parks and Recreation facilities that people are able to increase their physical activity which is conducive to preventing chronic disease and obesity. So that's my health hat.

I also think that the importance of Parks and Recreation and having a great place where people can enjoy the out-of-doors, as well as the indoor facilities, is what it brings to our county. A lot of us choose to live here because of what a great place it is. That includes the rural agriculture. It includes the great parks, not only the county parks but our city parks, as well as our national parks. And there's a strong correlation between the quality of life and economic growth, so a lot of companies choose to come to Skagit County because of the facilities and the nearness that we have to these great facilities.

I also wanted to point out that there is consensus that trails are the most sought-after recreation facility from many sources of Skagit County public opinion repeatedly, whether it's the Open Space Plan or the last several Skagit County Parks Plans or the Mount Vernon update of their comprehensive parks plan. Over and over and over the public tells us again the importance of trails in their community and that they want them. And this is true of what the statewide analysis points out to us.

I also think that the public did have a lot of opportunity to participate in this planning process with the number of meetings that the Parks Board held, not only our monthly meetings where everyone had an opportunity to comment on the process but also the meetings that we held throughout the county. So I would encourage you to recommend the Plan be approved. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Okay, Martha Bray, followed by Carol Ehlers.

Martha Bray: Good evening. My name is Martha Bray, B-r-a-y. I represent Skagit Land Trust. We are at 1020 South Third Street in Mount Vernon. My home address is 6368 Erwin Lane, Sedro-Woolley. Skagit Land Trust protects open space, wildlife habitat, and working farms and forestland throughout Skagit County. We have partnered numerous times with many organizations in the county and several times with Skagit County Parks, and it's been a really productive working relationship that's certainly not competitive in any way. We're here tonight to speak in support of the Parks and Rec's Plan. I think it's a balanced Plan and a good one, and represents a lot of hard work on the part of a lot of individuals. And, in particular, I'd like to speak in support of the goals for trails, natural resources, open space, and water access, and for Chapter 5, Habitat Conservation. I think that this is an important piece of any plan that's

going to address protecting the values that we all care about in Skagit County, and Skagit County has an important role to play in that. The County's Open Space Plan relies very heavily on non-profit work to protect open space in Skagit County and we can't do that without coordinating with local government, and it's an important piece of this.

And, again, I just want to emphasize that we're not competing and I don't think the Parks Department is trying to reinvent itself as a natural resources agency. The projects that we do with the Parks Department are very carefully thought out and they always involve public access. And we've done some great projects that allow for fishing and river access and access to trails, and we couldn't do those things without, you know, a really great Parks Department to work with.

So I think that's – and the other thing I wanted to just say is that numerous surveys and studies over and over again speak to how much the citizens of Skagit County value open space and trails. And we hear that from our members. We have a thousand household and business members in Skagit County, and over and over again what we hear is they want trails close to home and they want open space protected close to home. And all we have to do is look to Bellingham and to the west to Anacortes to see what an economic driver that protected open space is and how important it is to the future of our quality of life and to good jobs and good development here. So I urge you to adopt the Plan into the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan. Thanks.

Chair Lohman: Okay, thank you. Carol Ehlers, followed by Jeroldine Hebbler. Does that sound like somebody?

Jason Easton: I know that name!

Carol Ehlers: How do I get it bigger? Anyway. Push in? Okay. Carol Ehlers, E-h-l-e-r-s, Wind Crest Lane, West Fidalgo Island. I'm as much in favor of parks and trails as anyone in the room, but I'm very much in favor of due process and of the relationship of one plan to another plan, as mandated by GMA. The map that I show here is from the county trails map. It shows a trail going down Ginnett Road and then down Sharpe Road to Heart Lake Road and through the parks area. This area down Ginnett Road was the cause of an enormous uproar and huge meetings on Fidalgo Island because of the trespassing problem. I didn't go to them because I was then on the Planning Commission and I was going to listen when they came to us, but it quieted down. Then I see on this map all of a sudden it's here. You see, if there – according to state law – if there is no fence around a piece of property – entirely around, including the cliff or the edge of the lake – and no gate and no No Trespassing sign, you are free to go into almost any piece of property you want unless it's cropland. And if you steal something, it isn't burglary, It's theft. So there's a lot of people who want the consequence of a trail to be considered before it's approved. And that is why, as much as possible, when I was involved in doing trails planning we did it on public

land where there was no question as to the fact you could trespass anywhere you wanted to. And that I would like you to continue because this was not agreed to by the people who lived around there, and that is not appropriate public process.

Now as far as GMA, all the plans that have been done in this county have come before the Planning Commission with a study session so that the things that have been said here tonight can be sent to the Planning Commission; the Planning Commission can ask questions. There's a lot of questions that were raised, or ought to be raised in people's minds. You had a study session and then, after a period of time, you then had a hearing like this one. When you ask people to write you have to give them a final document. You need to have a copy in paper some place and the way they used to do it was to send it to Office Depot for the multi-copying place. They do it quite reasonably. I've had a number of things sent to me there. And then you have a paper copy and you can go from page 10 to page 40 and back and forth and see how it works. And usually you calm down a lot because what your initial impact is is, Well, they've modified this and they've explained it. And that's a process that actually involves the public. But this Plan has to relate to the Shoreline Plan, from what I've heard, and I don't know that it has. I've been to all the Shoreline meetings and I haven't heard any discussion of the relationship of this one to the proposed Shoreline one.

Mr. Axthelm: Carol, your time's up.

Ms. Ehlers: Okay. They *have* to relate, and it doesn't make sense for them *not* to relate. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Okay, Jeroldine Hamber, followed by Ed Stauffer.

Jeroldine Hallberg: Good evening. My name is Jeroldine Hallberg, spelled H-a-l-l-b-e-r-g, and my address is 6335 State Route 9, Sedro-Woolley. I'm here tonight to speak briefly in support of incorporation by reference of the 2012 Parks and Recreation Plan.

I worked for a time for the County and my last project was the 2009 Countywide UGA Open Space Plan, which you recommended adoption, and you had study sessions with large maps here in the room, and I just wanted to bring that to your attention because the two plans are related and I think when you incorporate by reference the Parks and Rec Plan we also out to have the – you know, the knowledge that the UGA Plan is in existence. I think the two of them will work well together, and I'm more convinced of that as I reviewed the Parks Plan online and became aware – sadly – again very mindful of the sobering information in the Parks Plan that financial support for County parks has declined by, I guess, about 50% or so. To me that's a dangerously low level. When we think about investing in these treasures for the future of the county we need to be adequately prepared for the demand that's certain to occur. Whether we ignore it or not,

people will demand and will be using open space and parks and trails – all of the above.

I believe that the UGA Open Space Plan and the County Parks Plan can be used together as guidance documents. They can be used to develop future funding options to present to the citizens. In fact, the Open Space Plan went into great detail to talk about some options for funding open space.

So, in summary, as you move ahead as I hope you will, I think it would be very helpful to reference both planning documents. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Sorry about massacring your name!

Ms. Hallberg: It's okay.

Chair Lohman: Ed Stauffer. And if there's somebody after Ed that would like to speak but did not sign up, there will be an opportunity for you.

Ed Stauffer: Stauffer, S-t-a-u-f-f-e-r, Box 114, Bow, Washington. I'm signed up on the listserver for notices of meetings and I never got a listserver announcement of any Park Advisory Board meetings in the last several years. I did read all the minutes of all Parks Advisory Board committee meetings going back to the year 2007 before I found a reference that they had two consecutive meetings where they discussed the idea of the Open Space Plan revision, what you're now considering tonight for adoption. This has been laying in the weeds for a long time. It runs some 204 pages long. I would say in my estimation at least 95% of those pages are ideological ruminations. If you crossed those out you'd have left a very workable, usable Parks and Recreation Plan which we now have in place and which is used every day. One thing that it does leave out, in spite of the comments to the contrary tonight by staff, is we are, by RCW 36.70A, required to demonstrate consistency and congruency. Nowhere in this Plan or in the Open Space Plan – which, by the way, "open space" is an undefined concept; I challenge any of you to give me an operational definition of "open space." None of these plans mention anywhere the rural landscape. You represent the people of rural Skagit County. The largest residential community in this county is the rural community – over 2000 homes. The needs, the rights, the responsibilities, the Rural Element of the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan, the rights and responsibilities, the quality of life and lifestyle that in your – the rural residents of Skagit County – are not addressed in these plans. Do not adopt them until they are. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Anybody else?

Ellen Cooley: Good evening. I'm Ellen Cooley, 16340 Lookout Lane – that's C-o-o-l-e-y – in Bow. And I wasn't going to say anything but in lieu of Ed Stauffer's comments and me living in Bow I think it would be in my best interest to back his

comments or endorse them so that I as a rural resident am well served as possible. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Anybody else? Come on up.

Marie Erbstoesz: My name is Marie Erbstoesz, spelled E-r-b-s-t-o-e-s-z-e-r. I'm a resident of Mount Vernon, Washington, at 217 East Division. I've lived in this wonderful county for twenty – more than twenty-five years. We moved here in 1975. I'm interested in hearing what is going on tonight. I'm a member of the Active Community Task Force here in Skagit County and also the Urban Trails Committee in Mount Vernon. My career is in health care and health services. I certainly see where Parks and Recreation are important not only to making this a wonderful community to live in – that's what attracted us here in 1975 – but also for the health and well-being and the economic development of the county. I think we have to look very broadly at the whole picture. I'm very encouraged about the Comp Plan and I certainly encourage the group here tonight to pass C-1, the proposal to amend the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan. I would encourage movement on that. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Anybody else?

(silence)

Chairman Lohman: Okay, seeing nobody I'm going to close the hearing on the first proposal, which is the Parks proposal, and we'll move into the public hearing for proposal number 2. And just as a reminder, this is the one to redesignate and rezone P118792, the about .3-acre parcel owned by the Del Mar Community Water Service, and the two water tanks. Kirk, was there anybody signed in on that one?

Kirk Johnson: Yeah, there ____.

Mr. Christensen: Okay, let me begin by describing the second proposal which is before us this evening. This indeed is a proposal to redesignate and rezone a parcel 118792 which is approximately .3-acre parcel which is owned by the Del Mar Community Service on which there are located two water tanks, and to change the designation from Rural Resource-NRL to Rural Reserve. The subject property is generally described as located on Fidalgo Island, south of Marine Drive, east of Rosario Road, and north and west of Sharpe Lane and Sharpe Road. The parcel immediately to the northwest, P19168, was redesignated from Rural Reserve – I'm sorry – Rural Resource-NRL to Rural Reserve in last year's Comprehensive Plan Amendment docket – that was back in 2011 actually – leaving P118792, which is the parcel under consideration this evening, as an isolated land or a spot zone of Rural Resource-NRL.

The proposal tonight is really a housekeeping matter. The Department is proposing that it be redesignated to be consistent with adjoining properties and that we remedy the situation by redesignating the subject property to Rural Reserve, which would be consistent with the properties surrounding it on all sides. As this map indicates, you have this island amongst acres and acres of Rural Reserve and it was simply just omitted in a similar process last year.

As I indicated earlier, there are two water tanks onsite owned by Del Mar as part of their water purveyor services.

This is a County-initiated proposal to address an isolated property whose land use designation zoning is not consistent with adjacent and surrounding properties. As I indicated earlier, back in 2011 through ordinance O20120008 Skagit County approved the designation of adjacent and surrounding properties as Rural Reserve on the Comprehensive Plan zoning map. The subject property was inadvertently omitted during the amendment rezone process. This proposal seeks to address that spot zone by approving a reclassification for the subject property which would be the same as adjacent and surrounding properties, as the map indicated.

So the Department's recommendation is based on its analysis. The Department concludes that the proposed map redesignation be approved as described and as illustrated in the staff report. With regard to consistency the proposal, if approved, would be consistent with GMA, RCW 36.70A.070(5) and the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan Rural Element, and the Rural Reserve land use designation criteria. This action would also address the former mapping error that left the subject property inconsistent with adjacent and surrounding land use designations.

And that is the extent of the Department's report recommendations.

Chair Lohman: Okay, the first speaker I have is Roger –

Roger Noar: Noar.

Chair Lohman: Noar, followed by Carol Ehlers.

Mr. Noar: My name is Roger Noar, N-o-a-r, and 6067 Central Avenue in South Fidalgo Island. I'm the President of the Board of Del Mar Community Service. We serve 300 homes. We're a private water system in rural South Fidalgo Island and those are our water tanks. And we are in favor of this proposal to rezone and make that tiny parcel consistent with all the surrounding parcels. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Thank you.

Ms. Ehlers: I'm Carol Ehlers, E-h-l-e-r-s, Wind Crest Lane. I'm also on the Board of this water system and I want to thank the Planning Department for recognizing the difficulty and dealing with it. It's exactly the kind of sensible thinking that, when it happens, one must say thanks.

Chair Lohman: Anybody else?

Mr. Stauffer: Ed Stauffer again, S-t-a-u-f-f-e-r, 114, Bow, Washington. I'd like to submit this as an example of where the process works. We started work on GMA in the early 1900s and we adopted the plan in 1996 – the original version. This adjustment to a rural land use is what we had in mind for being able to modify the plan in case an error was made that we needed room for correction. If you take a look at the number of these land use adjustments that have been brought before the Planning Commission since 1996, I think you'll find that Skagit County's plan to prevent urban sprawl is working.

Chair Lohman: Anybody else?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Okay, seeing nobody we'll move on to the third proposal, and I'll let Gary introduce it.

Mr. Christensen: Okay, this is a proposal to redesignate and rezone four parcels – P74450, P103560, P103559 and P74451 – which are 1.5 acres in size, to Rural Business or RB. The subject parcels are generally described as located along the east side of Swinomish Channel and north and west of the Town of La Conner and the Port of Skagit County. The subject properties were designated and zoned Commercial in 1992. Subsequent Comprehensive Plan updates indicated in error that the property was located within the corporate limits of the town of La Conner. This proposal rectifies that inadvertent mapping error.

So, so that you understand or know – so this is South Pearl Jensen Way and it winds its way around here to North Pearl Jensen Way and the subject property is this area outlined in red. This is the Swinomish Channel. This is Port of Skagit County Marina. Is that right, Patsy?

Patsy Martin: Yes.

Mr. Christensen: So north would be to the top of the page. If you – if an aerial helps, you can see that North Pearl Jensen Way comes around from the north and then becomes West Pearl Lane. There is an existing single-family residence located on the subject property. It's really isolated and there's a lot of marine-related business activity that supports the marina operations there. Again, this is the Swinomish Channel right here.

This is a County-initiated proposal to rectify an inadvertent mapping error which did not recognize a previous Skagit County action to designate several properties for Commercial Light Industrial development. In 1992 Skagit County approved the resolution number 14361. A Comprehensive Plan Amendment referenced as CPA92-011, which in effect reclassified the above-referenced parcels from Agriculture to Commercial. The current Skagit County Comprehensive Plan incorrectly indicates that the subject properties are within the Town of La Conner corporate limits.

Then, as is now, the subject property was and is being used for marine-related support industries. A single-family residence is located onsite, as well as marine-related activities. It's proximity abutting the Swinomish Channel and the Port of Skagit County Marina and other related marine industry businesses reaffirms that the land be designated for similar uses. In the short term a Rural Business map designation will allow existing land uses to remain in effect and allow limited changes and uses and reasonable expansion under Skagit County Code. In the long term, the subject property should be within the La Conner urban growth area and/or annexed into the Town.

The Department's recommendation is that, based on the analysis, we conclude that the proposed map redesignation be approved as described and illustrated in the staff report. Regarding consistency, the proposal, if approved, would be consistent with GMA, RCW 36.70A.070(5) and the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan Rural Element and Rural Business Land Use designation narrative. This action would also address the mapping error which incorrectly indicated that the subject properties are located in the Town of La Conner. A Rural Business designation would allow commercial industrial activity, more consistent with current uses both inside and outside of the Town's corporate limits. That is the extent of the Department's report and recommendations.

Chair Lohman: Okay.

Mr. Johnson: Nobody signed up on the list.

Chair Lohman: Did anybody wish to speak on this amendment?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Okay, seeing none we'll move on to the fourth proposal.

Mr. Johnson: Okay. I will introduce that. I'm Kirk Johnson, Senior Planner. Dale Pernula and Ryan gave you a very detailed overview of the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan revisions at your October 15th meeting, so I plan to be very brief. Dale is unable to be here tonight but he will be back for your deliberations beginning next Tuesday evening.

Planning and Development Services drafted the proposed revisions to the 2008 Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan at the direction of the Board of County Commissioners. The most significant proposed change to the Plan is the addition of 110 acres of Industrial zoning at Bayview Ridge adjacent to the Skagit Regional Airport and the Business Park, replacing an equivalent amount of Residential, Community Center and Urban Reserve zoning. The additional 110 acres of Industrial is consistent with the County's existing allocation of Industrial land through the Countywide Planning Policies. This expansion of the Industrial zoning would expand opportunities for industrial uses and job creation near the Skagit Regional Airport and Business Park, and minimize land use conflicts between the airport and residential areas.

The Subarea Plan revisions also contain new policies that would allow changing the size of the Community Center zone or expanding the Light Industrial zone under certain conditions in the future.

The Plan would move the Community Center zone to both sides of Peterson Road.

There are updates to the Capital Facilities chapter to reflect current plans and conditions.

There're some miscellaneous updates to correct grammar, names, facts, and figures, which you heard extensively about two weeks ago.

The proposed Subarea Plan revisions also make changes to certain policies to ensure consistency with a future Planned Unit Development – or PUD – ordinance; however, the Board of County Commissioners has placed the Planned Unit Development ordinance and Design Standards code on hold at this time so that the County can continue to evaluate school siting issues before moving forward with allowing residential development to occur.

So what's before you tonight is the proposed Subarea Plan changes. In summary, the Department recommends approval of the proposed Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan revisions which, as described, will create an additional 110 acres of Bayview Ridge Light Industrial zoning near the Skagit Regional Airport.

Chair Lohman: Okay, we'll wait a moment while we get the sign-up list. Thank you. Okay, first up I have Tim Rosenhan, followed by Teresa Taylor.

Mr. Easton: Terica.

Chair Lohman: Terica Taylor.

Tim Rosenhan: My name is Tim Rosenhan, R-o-s-e-n-h-a-n. I live on Samish Island. I support the industrial rezoning. I wanted to talk a little bit more generally about the proposed new town at – I may need a twelve-year-old to help me out with this. How do I get the slide show started? Now I'm fine. Thank you.

I have an aviation background. I've been a Marine Corps pilot. I've managed Skagit Regional Airport and I spent a career doing airport planning, mostly in airports in Puget Sound, including doing the master plans for NAS Whidbey Island. It makes me wonder why we would want to build a new town half the size of Sedro-Woolley, denser than any other town in Skagit, right under the flight pattern of a growing, regionally important airport. There have been a number of things change since that Bayview plan was first conceived fifteen years ago. First of all, the population pressure is a lot less than it used to be – certainly less than fifteen years ago. But also the airport's changed. Its mission has changed. The accidents and regulations are up at the airport.

First of all, looking at population figures this last decade's population growth is less than half what that percentage was in the previous decade. And now the 2012 Office of Financial Management projections show that out in twenty years we could have 25,000 fewer people in Skagit County than has been projected on the former growth curves. So there's less need to provide housing.

Also the airport has changed significantly. The airport did not used to have a mission statement, and the last couple of years the Port of Skagit County has created that mission statement and they now see it as a business airport similar to what they see as a model in Hillsboro, Oregon. They didn't have jet fuel fifteen years ago out there. They now have jet fuel. They now have a very credible instrument approach and they now have roughly one jet operation there per day.

The airport value of the area has been quantified by Washington State Department of Transportation at \$57 million per year economic impact to the region. A history of airports and housing conflict are all over Puget Sound. I mention four airports here: Anacortes, which is a poster child for bad airport planning; the outlying field at Coupeville, which is where the Navy practices carrier landings, is currently involved in a lawsuit with the local residents at Admiralty Cove suing the Navy because of guess what? Airport noise. Paine Field has trouble securing an air carrier for scheduled flights. That periodically comes up there because the people at Mukilteo object to noise and that continued amount of operations, and since it's a county-owned airport they're subject to political pressure that restricts them. And SeaTac I won't even get into much. It's just a sea of litigation because of nearby housing.

Mr. Axthelm: Your time is up.

Unidentified female voice in the audience: I'll give him my three minutes.

Mr. Easton: Can – Madame Chair?

Chair Lohman: Go ahead, Jason.

Mr. Easton: May I suggest that you submit your slides as part of the record?

Unidentified male voice in the audience: Will you give that to everybody that's in the room tonight then? I mean, mail it out to us?

Chair Lohman: Could we put this on the website?

Same unidentified male voice: He had some very good valid points.

Mr. Easton: Sir? You can't be heard by the folks at home so – the question from the audience was: Can these comments that I've asked to be put on the record be available by the website? I believe in the past that we do take the – we take the public comment and post it on the website so that every – all things that are written – submitted writingly – will be attached to this on the website. Is that correct?

Mr. Johnson: Right. The public comment period runs through Thursday so typically what we do is we wait until the public comment period closes –

Mr. Easton: And then post it?

Mr. Johnson: We alphabetize the comments and then we post them. So it probably wouldn't be up until Friday.

Mr. Easton: Okay. I mean, it'll be available.

Mr. Rosenhan: Jason, I have submitted a letter.

Ms. Bynum: I think the pleasure of the audience is to hear the presentation, if you would allow that, Madam Chair.

Ms. Ehlers: Besides, Tim, weren't you the one who was at that Transportation meeting that _____ and the others were at?

Chair Lohman: I'm sorry. We – excuse me – we published that it was three minutes of oral testimony and unlimited on written, so can you summarize your remarks and then we'll move on to the next person?

Mr. Rosenhan: Okay. I just wanted to say that there have been accidents at the airport. That's also a factor as well as the noise conflicts. I have submitted a report to Annie and that contains all my presentation for tonight. Thank you.

Mr. Easton: I'm asking for something in addition to the letter that you submitted, Tim. I'm asking that you could –

Chair Lohman: This PowerPoint.

Mr. Easton: – put the PowerPoint on the record so that we could review it, if that's – is that something you could turn over to the County between now and 7:30 on Thursday?

(laughter)

Mr. Rosenhan: Possibly.

Mr. Easton: Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. The next speaker is Terica Taylor, followed by Mike O-something. Is it O'Donnell?

Mr. Easton: Is there a Mike O'Donnell?

Mike O'Donnell: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Okay.

Chair Lohman: Terica?

Terica Taylor: My name's Terica Taylor. That's T-a-y-l-o-r, and my address is 204 West Montgomery in Mount Vernon, Washington. I work for the Economic Development Association of Skagit County and I'm here specifically to talk about the 110-acre – er, is it acres? I forgot.

Mr. Easton: Yes.

Ms. Taylor: – related to the new industrial zoning. And we want to share our support for industrial zoning in general in Skagit County, because as we work to bring companies to the region it's important for us to have these things in place *before* they begin to look. And right now we have about thirty active companies that we're working with that are in expansion or relocation mode and they need to have these industrial zones available to them to be built upon. So it's very important to us that this moves forward in a timely manner so that we can move forward with these companies that we're working with. And I'm *only* here to speak about that area of the Bayview Ridge Plan. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. Roger Howard is after Mr. O'Donnell. No, you're next. You're next, sir. I was just telling the next person behind you.

Mr. O'Donnell: Mike O'Donnell, capital O-apostrophe-capital D-o-n-n-e-I-I, 12674 Wedgewood Drive, Burlington. It continues to baffle me why you would build a community where there's 1000 acres of probably the prime industrial land between Vancouver, B.C. and Everett, Washington; why you would put a high density, low income housing up there; why you would put the burden of all the development on existing taxpayers because it *will* end up as part of the low income housing of Skagit County, which does not pay any taxes. We already have over 200 units in the Burlington School District that were paid for. Why you would do that. People have not supported you. The only people that support you are yourselves. You keep moving forward. This was done back in 1996. Why you don't review it as of today I'll never understand.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. Roger Howard, followed by Mike Anderson.

Roger Howard: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Roger Howard, H-o-w-a-r-d. My address is 18449 Andis Place in Burlington. I am the President of the Burlington-Edison School Board. We have been watching this development very closely. It obviously will have a significant economic impact to the Burlington School District. We've been working with the Skagit County Board of Commissioners and the Skagit County Planning Department on trying to find a suitable site for a future school that will be driven by the population anticipated by this development. It has been a significant challenge to try to find a suitable site at that development area due to the recent information from the Department of Transportation's Aviation Division on siting schools in an area of this type of development.

I do have to say that we are in support of the Subarea Plan amendment and we appreciate your review and scrutiny of this development as you have been doing, and we hope to contribute and be involved in future discussions on this development. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Okay, Mike Anderson, followed by Ellen Bynum.

Mike Anderson: My name's Mike Anderson, A-n-d-e-r-s-o-n. My address is 325 Metcalf, Sedro-Woolley, Washington. I'm speaking mostly about the population growth. I think it's a bad idea to develop the Bayview Ridge population. I think you, acting as planners, you need to think out a hundred years, unless we're talking about moving the airport, which I don't think we are. I see potential conflicts, as Tim's speaking about.

What I want to know is: Why are we spending millions of County tax dollars on this development? Are we doing it to benefit owners of some ag land so they can build condos and apartments? I think this directly would – this development would directly compete with our cities, which are already set up for it. I have heard talk about the future population growth coming to Skagit County in the next fifty years as a reason. Suppose we build a community of 5000 at Bayview View

that shop in Burlington. More sales tax for Burlington. Good for Burlington. How do you pay for the daily costs that this proposed community would generate? You have police, fire, schools, parks, roads, administration, et cetera. Does the County provide these services at the expense of everyone else in the county? Do you raise property taxes countywide to support this pocket of growth? I think this has been discussed many times before ____ Growth Management Act.

Take it from a mayor of a city that has funding issues. You need a community that has balanced revenue sources using local property taxes, especially one having a vibrant sales tax. In the future the community proposed at Bayview Ridge would have the same funding problems that Sedro-Woolley currently has unless it creates its own identity large enough of a population to support commercial activity. It will be too close to Burlington's commercial stores to have its own stores and thus no sales tax to help provide the necessary services.

Now I'm going to put on my Sedro-Woolley Mayor hat on. Our city is preparing for future growth and we've spent 35 to 40 million in the last seven years upgrading our sewer system, running our new lines up Duke Hill to the new middle school; new fire station, too, including fire equipment; a new city hall, including our streets, roads and systems; acquiring acres of more park land; running sidewalks. We are just located four miles east of I-5. We're not in Montana. We're in Skagit County. The land is all ready to develop. We're out of the floodway; we're not taking farmland like Bayview Ridge is; we have utilities available; our schools are built – and I believe they're the best in Skagit County. We're ready to grow, so why spend County time, resources and taxpayers' money to build another duplicate infrastructure and compete with us? It doesn't make sense unless you're one of the current property owners. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. Ellen Bynum, followed by Carol Ehlers.

Ms. Bynum: Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County, 110 North First Street. Mayor Anderson has an interesting point that the cities are certainly spending money. One of the goals of GMA was a concept called concurrency and that basically means that you do have those kinds of services and utilities available at the time that you allow development. The cost of concurrency is generally thought to be better paid for by developers, that is, the people who are wanting to do the development. Now hold that in your mind when you ask yourself the question: The 110 acres is going to be a part of the county; it's not going to be a part of the Port; the County is going to pay for the concurrency costs of the 110 acres, or are they going to secure developers who pay for that?

The Planning Commission has upon a few occasions noted that it is better if you have cost-sharing and it is *best* if you have the developer pick up the tab for that. So my question to the Planning Commission is, Do you have any indication of who's paying and what we get for it if the public has to pay for the concurrency costs for the development? And I'm talking about for the whole of Bayview Ridge

as well as the industrial areas. I do understand the reason you'd like to consider the 110 rezone, because you get more tax dollars off of industrial. And face it: The County is going to be out of money if it continues to cede its taxable land to the cities, which is going to happen eventually. So then we're going to be talking about cost-sharing with the cities which none of the cities want to talk about.

But that's a problem for the future. I think now we need to really, seriously look at the cost of concurrency. It appears to be undiscussed at, you know, at any kind of detailed level, and I don't know if that's because the County hasn't made a commitment or a budgetary commitment to doing it or if you haven't secured a developer to do the development. So that's of concern to me. Otherwise I think it makes more sense to have industrial land there than to have schools and houses. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Carol Ehlers, followed by Jon Sitkin.

Ms. Ehlers: There's courses in how you manage these things, but I didn't take them. Carol Ehlers, E-h-l-e-r-s, Wind Crest Lane, West Fidalgo Island. The Bayview Ridge Plan has been discussed at some length ever since 1959, and fortunately nothing was done fifty years ago because we had no concept of what the airport could become; we had no concept the railroads would be restored; State Route 20 was a nightmare to drive under any circumstances. It was a mirror whenever it rained, and you know how that's like. And the discussion in those days was having quarter-acre lots all over the surface because everyone knew that with that clay mesa it wasn't good farmland and it wasn't good forestland. And there's an EIS from 1972 with quarter-acre zoning.

What is proposed now is light years better and I think is – for the industrial area – is absolutely exciting. You have a situation in which an airport with a good deal of imagination and leadership – things that Tim Rosenhan brought up were brought up at a transportation meeting that I mentioned last time and no one wanted to hear about. The railroad is crucial. SCOG has a plan regarding transportation, which is one of the essential concurrencies no matter what you do. Even if you don't do anything you have to plan the transportation, the road transportation. That SCOG document is very detailed but it doesn't know there is any east-west railroad in this county, much less one that blocked Farm to Market Road with a parked train the other day and clogged up Best Road because the light wouldn't change from red, and the people on Best Road going north couldn't go anywhere. So it was this long line of cars and trucks. Somebody's got to start thinking of the relationship of air, rail, and road, and a road engineer that works for the County is not trained in dealing with those three areas. And I'm not suggesting hiring a consultant; I'm suggesting thinking among staff that are already here.

Now that it's talked about for industrial, all sorts of things are appearing. AT&T is planning to put up a real cell tower. Just think of the area that could have decent cell service now that doesn't have it.

The flight museum is coming. There's been a lot of visits by various ancient airplanes that a lot of us have gone to, and now they're talking about moving the flight museum from Bellingham to the airport. So it's a kind of the imaginative use of the airport that has never occurred before, and that's a changing condition that I think is very good. There was an article the other day in the paper that they really high speed Internet – broadband – up there, which is not common in this county. If you go on the Internet and you have a big enough computer and you got enough time you can download the U.S. broadband map and then the state broadband map and then the county broadband map and you find it's not a pretty picture.

Mr. Axthelm: You're out of time.

Ms. Ehlers: They did it once here.

Mr. Axthelm: Carol, you're out of time.

Ms. Ehlers: Okay. That is Josh Wilson Road. It's got a connection to the Interstate. It's part of what has to be widened.

Chair Lohman: Thank you.

Ms. Ehlers: And I want to turn this in as a document. I understand it can only be 8½ by 11. The legend down below says it's a federal map, 2003, and this declaration that this is an urban growth area is why we justified the whole Growth Management thing in Bayview. You can cut it to your size as you wish.

Chair Lohman: Thank you, Carol. Jon Sitkin, followed by Patsy Martin.

Jon Sitkin: Thank you, Madame Chairman. I have a letter to submit. I've given the original to Ryan Walters and if I could pass this out to the Commission, if we have time. May I approach?

Chair Lohman: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Sitkin: When you're in court, you ask to approach the bench!

Mr. Easton: You really sound like a lawyer when you talk like that, Jon!

Chair Lohman: Scare us!

Mr. Sitkin: Jon Sitkin, 1500 Railroad Avenue, Bellingham. So I'd like to take an opportunity to address just the issues before you and not other issues. I'm welcome to that debate on what appropriate airport overlay zones are, and that's a subject of a lot of interpretation and debate. But what's before you is the industrial zoning. And I appreciate the comments and I would love to – I haven't heard anyone come out in opposition to the request. I've got a question of concern but no one thus far, and I'm not anticipating Patsy to oppose the request, but I'm aware that I'm not hearing any opposition.

But I want to address a couple of questions. One I think we talked in response to questions before, but developer contribution to the development of infrastructure. I appreciate the concurrency comments that were made and that's an essential part of your ordinance in Skagit County that has developed is a series of concurrency regulations as part of your code now. And the way the extension and development of infrastructure would be is that the developer would work with the service provider – water, sewer, for instance – to extend any mains at the developer's cost to the property to serve the property. Any road improvements that would be necessary, onsite roads, the developer to develop. If there's any capacity on the existing roads, the developer would work to pay for their fair share of that. If they need expansion, they'd pay for their fair share of that expansion, work with the Public Works Department through the processes through a reimbursement agreement or other process to ensure that the adequate services exist. So there are structures through the environmental review process, through agreements with the service providers as conditions of extension, where the developer pays for those infrastructure developments and their fair share. They don't have to cure deficiencies, and that's the misnomer. If there's a deficiency of existing systems – be it roads, storm – a new developer doesn't have to cure deficiencies, but they do pay for their impact.

And it was addressed or questions raised by the Mayor – is he still here? Ah, he may have run to see the election counts – but others about the fiscal impact study. And I'd ask you, if you look at the addendum that just came out – the original fiscal impact study for Bayview Ridge – but go back to the 2012 fiscal impact study that was prepared by ECONorthwest for Skagit County and Growth Management implications. There they encourage the high density development in Skagit County because of the economies of scale to spread the cost of services over a greater number of units. You come to – and particularly with Public Works and road reimbursement costs for maintenance and operations. That was one of their points there. When you look at the fiscal impact study and the addendum they said, Well, they looked at a per-mile cost. Well, of course a per-mile cost throughout the whole county could be greater than just doing it per-unit cost in an area of an urban area for roads and maintenance. Just an interesting way you might approach the statistics – the road costs that were provided to you by Public Works. In a number of cases those segments that were provided to you in the fiscal impact study included water and sewer utilities that would be included in the road cost. Well, those should be stripped out.

Those would be a developer cost. I point that out because there was an assumption of a 50% developer contribution to all the costs of infrastructure. When you really get into it you could pull out more than 50% and, you know, we're all cowboy mathing it, but I think it'd be higher when you pull out the water and sewer but put the developer contributions to all the infrastructure that would be developed. For instance, the north-south connector that would primarily be a private or a combination of Port cost to go to that northern extension. That wouldn't necessarily be a County extension.

I'm going beyond the industrial discussion, going larger into the fiscal impact study of the whole Bayview Ridge development, but I wanted to bring those points out to you because that is part of your record. I address them briefly here.

We support the 100 acres –

Mr. Axthelm: Three minutes.

Mr. Sitkin: I didn't hear anybody tell me, but I appreciate that if it is. I'll cut it off at three minutes. We support the proposal. Thank you. I saw the notice for three minutes, too, and I tried to __ my time.

Chair Lohman: Okay. Patsy Martin.

Mr. Axthelm: I've allowed a little bit of time here and there for names, so I do let you get through your names!

Mr. Sitkin: Thank you. Thank you very much. I'm __ – fair is fair.

Ms. Martin: Hi, I am Patsy Martin with the Port of Skagit, M-a-r-t-i-n, at Post Office Box 348, Burlington, Washington. I'm here to talk a little bit about the proposal, but more importantly talk a little bit about the Port. Our purpose is good jobs for the Valley. We've tried to do many, many different things to do that but what's specific to Bayview Ridge (is) back in 1996 we teamed together with Skagit County, with private landowners, with the school district, with the fire district and with many other entities to appropriately plan for Bayview Ridge. And we put together the best plan we knew how in 1996, and we've been living with that, we've been growing beautifully, and some of Tim's comments reflect that. And with that growth comes other things like accidents that we have to deal with.

As a part of all that planning, we all adopted some safety overlay zones that tried to put a framework around that airport to make sure it doesn't have the problems that Anacortes has, to make sure that we can continue to grow the way we need to. We've also __ that, as I said.

Now Washington State Department of Transportation has come in, not necessarily at any of our requests, and said that they have updated information

based on more current accident data. That information has put different lines on a map. We're willing to work with everybody to try to understand how that affects us all, but we will be respecting those lines on the map for two reasons: one, safety. As we understand, they're based on accident data and we want to understand how that affects all of us but we will be paying attention to that. Two, a practical reason: 95% of all the money we get to put capital improvements in our airport come from the Federal Aviation Administration and Washington State Department of Transportation Aviation Division. With that comes a thing that we sign called assurances. We sign a document that says we will fight against incompatible land uses, and when they have shown us on a map that something is incompatible we will respect that. So I just need to make sure that you guys understand that. But we will continue to work with everyone as we have since 1996 to have the best plan for that region as we can. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Okay, is there anybody else who did not sign up that wishes to speak? Come on up.

Ms. Cooley: I'm Ellen Cooley again, 16340 Lookout Lane, Bow, and I am very pro the industrial rezone. I have strong reservations about building housing out there and a school, given the four pipelines that cross there and the accident data that Tim put forth. And thank you.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. Anybody else?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Okay, seeing none we will close the public hearing on the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan.

Mr. Easton: Madame Chair? I just want to remind the public that testified tonight that it's the intentions at times for each of these Commissioners to recall you as a witness during deliberations. So if you or one of your representatives could make yourself available for the next meeting when we deliberate on this it would be very helpful, because that's the time when the Commissioners will ask – may have questions to ask you.

Chair Lohman: Okay. Well, moving on on our agenda we're going to move into deliberations on the Capital Facilities Plan Update.

Gary, were you going to do an introduction on that?

Mr. Christensen: I am not. Ryan is.

Chair Lohman: Oh, Ryan is. You're off the hook.

Mr. Christensen: It's tag team tonight.

Chair Lohman: Okay. So, Ryan, were you going to speak from there?

Mr. Walters: I'm not sure that we have too much to present. You got the presentation and had the public hearing in meetings prior. One thing that we do have is an updated water system table, as we've been telling you about. It still does not have information from the tribes, but it's got everybody else.

Mr. Easton: So it's an updated water table but it doesn't have the information from the tribes. So somebody could _____?

Mr. Walters: That's right. It's got all the other publicly-held water systems. Their information's summarized, but we just didn't receive the Swinomish or Upper Skagit water system plans so there isn't a summary there and those plans aren't on the website, unlike the others.

Mr. Easton: So how do we – with that particular issue, can I ask you a question about it? Without having those, do we need to postpone this?

Mr. Walters: No. There are other districts that we don't have information from. There's at least one fire district. I think there's at least one drainage district or something. You see them in the – in the tables they're identified as "County did not receive plan." The Capital Facilities Plan for the *County* is within our control. The Capital Facilities Plan Part II for all these other providers is not entirely within our control. Those other providers are their own public entities and if they don't provide us the information they don't provide us the information.

Mr. Easton: So the second piece of the puzzle's not as much about compliance as much as it is about a gathering place?

Mr. Walters: It is. The purpose of that second part of the Plan is to bring all this information together so that other entities can read it, they can coordinate, they can see how the capital facilities planning for all these other districts is coordinated.

Chair Lohman: And as we learned at the public hearing and other Planning Commission meetings, it really isn't necessarily an exhaustive list of everything, correct? It's an attempt to get it all down?

Mr. Walters: Right. Right, it's supposed to be –

Chair Lohman: And then there's – you have the intention sometimes something is – where the public feels that they – they *believe* that the facility is public but it's actually private, like a developer-required structure of some sort.

Mr. Walters: That did come up and the test for whether an item should be included is based on the definition that's in the Plan and based on the GMA requirement, which is that we're planning for *publicly*-owned facilities. We're not planning for privately-held facilities. So, for instance, water systems: There are only – I don't know – eight or nine water systems on this list. There're probably hundreds of water systems in Skagit County, but many of them are privately-held water systems and we don't do capital facilities planning related to the privately-held ones.

Mr. Easton: So we received a preliminary – well, a model we could use for the ordinance/resolution –

Mr. Walters: Recorded motion.

Mr. Easton: Excuse me. Thank you – recorded motion. There would have been some – when I reviewed it – I'm not sure why it's not in this pile, but I must have left it on my desk – there were some changes that were referenced in there and they're, according to this – mostly for the benefit of the public, Ryan – but according to the e-mail to the Commission, Commissioner Greenwood and some of the comments that the public had made have been incorporated in some of the changes that are now shown as strikethroughs. Is that right?

Kaci Radcliffe: We included a list of recommendations that were a synthesis of some of the public comment and Planning Commission comments that we felt either were spoken to the staff report and agreed that the recommendation could be considered, or Planning Commission comments that were received that we wanted to pass through for deliberation.

Mr. Easton: So for the sake of helping to move things along maybe, Ryan, if you could go to the screen – or Kaci – and pull that up, I'd like to go through those recommendations really sort of quickly, and at least the public can see them on the screens since we all have had them e-mailed to us. This is that document that Ryan e-mailed out on November 1st, and now it's on our screens. I'm particularly interested in page 2 and then starting – there we go – starting in the Recommendations section.

So the first – before we get to Recommendations – the first part, basically the Whereases – if somebody else wants to come back to the Findings of Fact, I don't have any concerns with them. But before I was going to make a motion I wanted to talk about these real briefly. If we could go to the Recommendations – I'm comfortable with the Findings of Fact and the Reasons for Action. Let's talk about the recommendations for a second. So the first recommendation: Staff recommends that the schools summary table on page 53 indicates that "BEHS" has 41 portable classrooms. Shouldn't that – so it's being changed actually to read "BESD."

Ms. Radcliffe: The School District instead of the High School.

Mr. Walters: That's right. That's one of the things that –

Chair Lohman: It's a typo.

Mr. Walters: – identified a typo.

Mr. Easton: Great. The water utilities summary table on page 57 should be replaced with the attachment. That was the attachment that was just distributed?

Chair Lohman: Right.

Ms. Radcliffe: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Okay. The Parks and Trails Inventory table on page 19 should be sorted into "County-Owned" and other ownership groups, suggested by Commissioner Greenwood. Do you want to expand on that, Keith? That's pretty straightforward.

Keith Greenwood: Just that I think it makes it clearer for us to understand what we are responsible for and have obligations for maintenance on. If you can sort those out so we can – when they start to get kind of mixed in it becomes ____.

Chair Lohman: Right.

Mr. Easton: Number 4: The Plan should include explanations of funding sources, as in "Drainage Utilities" or the "Road Fund."

Ms. Radcliffe: And we included a summary of that in the supplemental staff report.

Mr. Easton: Okay. Number 5: The Public Waters Providers map on page 56 needs an alpha-numerical labeling since the areas are small and the colors too similar to differentiate. Straightforward.

Number 6: Change language for the paragraph on page 10: Because the County Transportation System, or TSP, which includes an inventory and the six-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which includes a financing plan are incorporated by reference, roads and non-motorized transportation projects that are included in those plans need not appear in the text of the CFP. Accordingly, trail projects – and now it is corrected to say, or changed to say – suggested change by the staff – as to: Accordingly, the trail projects other than those wholly within a park must be identified in the TIP. Okay, so this brings me the most – of these recommendations – probably the most level of slight confusion. It's probably because we're juggling acronyms. Is that a change that – that's a

change that was generated by questions by the public or was that a change generated by questions by the staff after they'd reviewed the staff report after they produced it?

Mr. Walters: That's a staff-recommended change.

Ms. Radcliffe: Right.

Mr. Easton: Based upon?

Mr. Walters: That is based on the comments by the public about, Should trail projects be in the TIP or in the CFP?

Chair Lohman: Well, and wasn't it identified that once upon a time it was on the TIP and then it wasn't on the TIP and there was some confusion, and so now by – didn't the RCW change? Because in your staff report you go into quite a bit of detail on that.

Ms. Radcliffe: And we actually had discussion with staff where our Facilities Director and County Administrator had an internal memo sent to actually talk about the CFP and TIP integration and how to adjust that process for next year.

Chair Lohman: So going forward you're not going to have this which-club-does-it-belong-to?

Ms. Radcliffe: We took the time to provide some clarity on when a trail would be included in the TIP versus the CFP – provided some clarity for that and adjustments to the process for the TIP so we could delineate when trails are included and when they're not. Because this, you know, transit versus recreational trail was an issue needing further discussion.

Chair Lohman: And my reference at the last Planning Commission on it was it was very difficult to find the Six-Year TIP, and the staff's answer was, Well, it's linked in this document. That doesn't really help you when you're on the website looking, but I did find it. It's in Public Works under Engineering under Programs. But if you could – my point was if you printed this out and you're not on the computer you can't leap to the TIP. The County website until you at – you did some changes – I believe it was you – to the website so now the TIP is easier to find. Because I went to it again today to test it.

Mr. Walters: We asked for the TIP to be added – a link to the Public Works TIP page be added to the CFP page.

Chair Lohman: Yes, and it was.

Mr. Walters: I don't think – with our current website I don't think we would want to put the web address into the document.

Chair Lohman: No.

Mr. Walters: Because the web addresses are this long, but they're supposed to be shorter _____.

Chair Lohman: But my point at the meeting, I think, was lost in the staff report. It was regardless of whether you have this and you can link from this, which is a nice feature; I love that interaction.

Ms. Radcliffe: _____ and you wouldn't necessarily _____.

Mr. Easton: And that's why I wonder if it would be somewhat redundant for people who are doing it online, but it would be for people who print it if there was a note there that the TIP can be viewed where it can be viewed. So next to the hyperlink or in parenthesis next to the hyperlink for the TIP.

Mr. Walters: With the URL.

Mr. Easton: Well, but I don't know if I'd necessarily put the URL in because URLs can change as the website ages – the potential that URL will change. But reference where it's at on the website.

Mr. Walters: So some text saying _____ Public Works Programs. Okay.

Mr. Easton: Some text that says where it would be on the website.

Mr. Walters: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: That seems to solve the printing problem. Move on to number 7.

Chair Lohman: Sorry to jump in like that.

Mr. Easton: No, that's good. So this is from staff. Change language for the paragraph on page 31: The Board of County Commissioners has directed through Skagit County Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element policy 8A-6.3 that the TIP fully comply with the statute by including any capital project anticipated in the next six years that is for a trail intended for non-motorized transportation. Parks and Recreation development capital projects for trails – and then strikethrough intended there. There's that strikethrough that goes "that are intended for recreation rather than transportation," and instead it's replaced with language that reads "other than those wholly within a park, must be included in the TIP." To me this addresses the confusion that was brought up in the public

testimony that I have in my notes. But it – I’m not sure if that’s accomplished for everybody else but it seems to clarify that to me.

Chair Lohman: Can you scroll down so we can see 6 and 7 together?

Mr. Easton: That’s perfect.

Mr. Walters: So 6 is supposed to be basically saying exactly what 7 does. It’s just now in both places in the document.

Chair Lohman: Right. You’re catching both places.

Mr. Easton: So Madame Chair? To move the discussion on to the point where we can discuss the document, I’m going to make a motion, if it’s all right with you at this time, to accept – and then obviously it’s open to amendment – but I’m going to move that we accept the – the Skagit County Planning Commission accepts the recorded motion in front of us which starts with “WHEREAS the Board of County Commissioners added 2014-2019 Capital Facilities Plan” and finishes with the recommendations page which is then signed by Annie and Kirk. So I make that as a motion.

Chair Lohman: Do we have a second?

Matt Mahaffie(?): Second.

Mr. Easton: So as the maker of the motion I’ll speak to it first, if that’s all right, Madame Chair.

Chair Lohman: Can you repeat the motion?

Mr. Easton: Yeah. Do you want to repeat it or do you want me to repeat it?

Chair Lohman: How about _____ the motion?

Mr. Easton: It’s fine – I can do it!

Chair Lohman: Well, _____ the Chair! It’s been moved and seconded that we accept the recorded motion presented to us. And since he stole my recorded motion –

Mr. Easton: I’ll give it back to you. Thank you. We moved along, though!

Chair Lohman: Starting with the “WHEREAS the Board of County Commissioners added the 2014-2019 Capital Facilities Plan Update” and ending with the signature page on page 3. Discussion.

Mr. Easton: So I'm going to go first since I made the motion. So I'm going to support the motion to approve the Capital Facilities Plan. This is, I think, my second one that I've been a part of – the second time that I've been a part of this. This is a much better process so kudos to staff on that. And I felt like the issues that were brought up by the public, some of those have been addressed. This is one of those complicated sort of places the Commission gets involved where we're handed multiple plans that dance in between each other and then we're asked to approve a plan that sort of has these things dancing in between each other instead of actually building the plan. So with that in mind, it's odd that we don't actually – in some ways we don't actually participate in actually the development of it but sort of left with making a recommendation to the Commissioners. So I feel comfortable with recommending it as it's provided tonight.

Chair Lohman: Elinor?

Elinor Nakis: Yes. When I was reviewing this I saw that there was both a Hansen Creek Reserve mentioned and also a Hansen Creek Park. They're both 3 acres of undeveloped park land with Hansen Creek frontage. But is this both the same piece of land or two separate pieces of land?

Ms. Radcliffe: We can check with Parks staff to see if those are in error or two different systems.

Ms. Nakis: Okay. That needs to be clarified and fixed.

Ms. Radcliffe: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: Can we address that – if it does come up as an error after approval before Annie signs the document? Could that be addressed?

Mr. Walters: I would recommend that you make a recommendation – to add that to your list of recommendations that it be reviewed.

Chair Lohman: Review the – so number 8, then, would be to review Hansen Creek and Hansen Reserve.

Mr. Easton: Yeah. Good catch, Elinor.

Chair Lohman: Excellent. Anybody else?

Mr. Walters: And where did we see Hansen Reserve?

Ms. Nakis: That's in the list of the community parks, page 29 – right in that area. I'm still scrolling. Okay, on page 26 there's mention of Hansen Creek Reserve, 3 acres, and then on page 32 there's mention of Hansen Creek Park.

Mr. Easton: So page 26 and page 32?

(several mostly unintelligible remarks)

Mr. Easton: So you could review it on both 26 and 32. That should be enough for staff to understand what we're looking at, in addition to the transcript.

Chair Lohman: You're in that awful position where you're writing and we're talking.

Mr. Easton: I noticed how Ryan delegated that to you!

Ms. Nakis: And I have to – I just want to make a comment. If this is the property that I think that it is, it was donated many years ago to Skagit County. It's sloughing off, and it's someday going to take out Hansen Creek – or Fruitdale Road, I believe. It isn't suitable for any kind of park or recreational use. It's about a 150-foot cliff maybe – 100-foot cliff. So just to mention that some people think that some private property down the road from there is that property because there is a camping area there that's maintained by the private owner, and sometimes they like to use that space because they do think that it's Hansen Creek Park because it was on a map about twenty years ago that some people still use. Anyway, I just thought I'd mention it.

Ms. Radcliffe: Thank you.

Mr. Easton: I have a ninth recommendation to add. It's come to my attention, being now that I am the senior member of the Fidalgo Island Club, that there was an inadvertent error in relationship to Fidalgo as it relates to Del Mar and Lake Chiquita.

Ms. Ehlers: And South Burrows Bay drainage.

Mr. Easton: So under number 9, note that Jason Easton is recommending the staff address this mapping error, the simple mapping error, with a member of the public, Carol Ehlers, who can bring – there's no need for us to testify about it, in my opinion; it's just a mapping error that didn't get recorded right – and Carol can bring those details in to bear. I don't think it's anything that we all should be overly concerned about, but if you have questions Carol's here to answer them about it. But from my point of view, it's a mapping error.

Chair Lohman: Anything else? Keith?

Mr. Greenwood: I'm still not sufficiently satisfied. I've gotten some answers to a couple of questions but, from a comparison standpoint, when we go to a different format to be able to compare this to previous years' plans, there is no

comparison. You have to look back to an entirely different format. So the amount of acres, the amount of capital facilities we have, an inventory – you can't put them side by side and compare them. So I would need some sort of summary of what changes we're proposing other than style, because in looking at previous years, or previous models, there are some substantial changes. And over time – and I heard it in several presentations today – over time we accumulate properties with costs associated with their maintenance and ownership, and if it's a cliff –

Ms. Nakis: Yeah.

Mr. Greenwood: – we're responsible for cleaning it up if it wipes out a road. So if we – and some of the concerns about the approach towards what-do-we-own/what-do-we-not-own/what-do-we-want-to-own, those are real legitimate issues, I think. Are we a conservation – if we start to get into conservation issues we start to maybe buy into some other obligations that we didn't think we had. So I would like some sort of – and I wouldn't hold this up on approving the Plan necessarily, but I'd like some summary of what the changes were from the previous Capital Facilities Plans to this one.

Mr. Easton: Is that something that already exists maybe in you guys' process as a staff?

Ms. Radcliffe: Well, we've written several paragraph summaries of the substantial changes. We don't have a full track-change document because the formal changed so significantly.

Mr. Easton: Yeah, and I don't think that's what Keith – I don't think that's what he's asking for.

Ms. Radcliffe: Yeah.

Chair Lohman: But then when you do change to this new style, Keith, it's like going to a different book publisher.

Mr. Greenwood: Right.

Chair Lohman: You have to sometimes accept that because we've changed the style and the interactiveness of it it isn't the same.

Mr. Greenwood: The next one will be easier. I acknowledge that. I'm sure.

Chair Lohman: The next one's going to have some continuity. So somewhere along the line you have to kind of take the plunge and take a deep breath and accept that this is how it's going to be from here forward.

Mr. Greenwood: And that's why I asked for a summary table, which was in all the other Plans that I could find, where it lists capital facilities by revenue source. And then you can have a comparison.

Chair Lohman: Maybe if you had that additional table.

Mr. Greenwood: I would love that additional table.

Chair Lohman: Capital – you know, by funding source. Because we did discuss quite a bit. There were some things in the drainage utility that may have possibly been left off the list because of their funding source: grant funding versus tax funding. So there's a gray area – should it be on the list or not on the list? And then you also have facilities that maybe they're under the Road – the Public Works under their Road Inventory, because they're integral to the road structure, but yet they're kind of dual purpose. So some of us feel they should be on this Plan because of their drainage or flood control component, but they're not on the list because they're considered part of the road. So maybe some things need to have an asterisk and they end up on two places.

Mr. Easton: So since we can't direct staff – I mean, we direct suggestions to you, the Commissioners, who then can choose to take ours and then direct them to staff. I have no – as the maker of the motion and I'm sure the seconder doesn't either, I would hope – have no concern about asking for that to be added. The Department's probably going to respond to the Commissioners about how much more time that'll take and that'll be a decision made by those people – by the Commissioners – probably in relationship to manpower or getting it finished. But, I mean, I don't think it's – I think it's an acceptable thing for you to add that as number 10, **as long as we're working into getting to them is really clear.**

Mr. Greenwood: Well, they provided an answer to me about not having that table because the summaries are in different segments of the document itself.

Mr. Easton: So is there a compromise that I might suggest, which is that we incorporate some of the summary language into the – that explains? So there's already – and this would appear to not take that long if you could cut and paste some of the summary information that's already been created and add it as an addendum or whatever – however, whatever way you think it would fit best in the document. This is stuff we've already – the summary stuff that you're talking about is stuff that was prepared for us as we prepared to get to this point. It's just not a part of the actual document, correct?

Ms. Radcliffe: And staff attempted in the narrative for a section of the document to describe, one, the process so that it could be duplicated in the future, but also some of the significant changes about the usability of the document – so inserting a section about some of the changes to provide that we maybe provided in the supplemental staff report. Is that maybe what we're talking about?

Mr. Easton: I think so. I think the supplemental staff report would accomplish that.

Mr. Greenwood: Sure. And I really do want to see some numbers. I like narrative but to compare previous – I mean, do we have \$2 billion worth of assets and now we have 2.5, or are we shrinking in that? I'd just like to be able to track that.

Mr. Easton: That's probably the point where the Commissioners are going to have to make a decision about whether to send this recommendation to your department head for you guys to do. So we could capture what Keith's saying. As the maker of the motion, I would be open to adding that as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Walters: And also I'm not sure if we previously understood that you were looking for a summary of total assets, but we may be able to generate that pretty easily.

Chair Lohman: And I have a potential number 11. I'll let you do 10 first. Sorry, Kaci.

Ms. Radcliffe: So projects – County and non-County included?

Mr. Greenwood: Yes. County primarily.

Ms. Radcliffe: Mm-hmm.

Chair Lohman: You could have a subtotal.

Mr. Easton: So even though Kaci's typing this – because we don't do this live action very often – for some of the newer Commissioners and so the public understands – she's a staff member typing what we want in our review. So we word it the way we want it worded. So it's – I don't want any confusion about the fact staff is not writing this section.

Chair Lohman: No.

Mr. Easton: The Commissioners are dictating to – one of us could be over there – just as well be over there typing it. So we're clear. So make sure that that's the wording for any of our additions that we want.

Ms. Radcliffe: I'm just your fingers.

Mr. Easton: Yes. Thank you, Kaci.

Mr. Greenwood: I'm looking for capital facilities by revenue source, so I'd like the revenue source attached to that.

Mr. Walters: Let me clarify that a little bit. Capital facilities – the capital facilities don't have revenue sources. The projects have revenue sources.

Mr. Greenwood: Correct.

Mr. Walters: So you want the projects –

Mr. Greenwood: Yes.

Mr. Walters: – aggregated by revenue source?

Mr. Greenwood: Yes, and there's an example in the last six-year plan on the last table, I think, a summary of the document, so if you want to look at that. I'd have to find the page number, but you'll find it. That's the title of the table: Capital Facilities by Revenue Source.

Mr. Easton: Do you want to add anything to that, Keith?

Mr. Greenwood: Any more – well, if Annie wants to do number 11, or are you just thinking number 10?

Chair Lohman: Number 11.

Ms. Radcliffe: Both staff reports or just the supplemental?

Mr. Greenwood: Both. I mean, I still have a couple other questions that I raised that I didn't feel adequately – they were answered, but I don't like the answer.

(laughter)

Mr. Greenwood: Just in that – I know that in the tables, I know this is – we list inventory and then we list projects proposed for the next six years, but we skip what we're doing right now. So even if it's in a different font, red letters or something, "in process," "in the works" – we're not trying to approve – they've already been approved but they're not quite inventoried so they're in the middle. But to see the entire continuum we could easily list those, especially where we're at now – to list what was 2013, what did we do. You could leave them in limbo if you want, but I'd like to see what those are so we can kind of see, Hey, we've already just bought another 2000 acres. Maybe we don't need to buy 2000 acres in the next year, too. So it just – it leaves a big hole. It's like a manhole in the middle of the road.

Chair Lohman: Are you thinking of it, like, transitional facilities and properties?

Mr. Greenwood: Just another column in the tables, because it shows inventory and then it shows planned projects and then there's a hole.

Chair Lohman: Yeah, I read that, too, and stumbled over it because it's kind of like then the next update all of a sudden they're captured, but on the prior one to this they're not there. So they're – it's kind of like losing a sock in a laundry.

Mr. Greenwood: Yeah, I've done that.

Chair Lohman: In a way.

Mr. Easton: Do you want to vent on that or do you want to –

Mr. Greenwood: No, no – that's good. About my socks? They're both the same color.

Mr. Easton: No, I'm –

Mr. Greenwood: But they're hidden from the table.

Mr. Easton: Nice.

Chair Lohman: What's your recommendation?

Mr. Easton: Do you want to add it as a recommendation?

Chair Lohman: How do you want it to be done?

Mr. Greenwood: I would like the 2013 projects that are planned and funded listed in the tables and qualified as such.

Mr. Easton: So that maybe we could say that they're – that they be distinguishable. That the 2013s that have been purchased and funded –

Mr. Greenwood: That are not in inventory but not in proposed to be adopted – have already – are in the table so that they show.

Mr. Easton: So while in the table they're distinguishable.

Mr. Greenwood: "Distinguishable": Sounds like a good word. I like that.

Mr. Easton: Okay, so maybe we word it like this – whatever he just said.

(laughter)

Mr. Walters: Another note about that, though, is that sometimes you'll have a facility – take like a bridge and a park, or maybe the facility only shows up as the park and the project is replacement of a bridge in the park. The bridge may not show up in the next plan because it will still just say the park.

Mr. Easton: We're closer, though.

Mr. Greenwood: It could show zero square footage. It could show zero dollars needed to be expended. It could show zero acres – that sort of thing. I mean, it'll still just be a bridge. That's fine. It does have a value, the bridge.

Mr. Walters: I guess maybe he's saying that the projects list does not always result in a new facility. It is sometimes just an upgrade of some existing facility.

Chair Lohman: Right. But you could say that. You could put "upgrade."

Mr. Walters: Right, right, right. You can list –

Chair Lohman: You could quantify what you spent.

Mr. Walters: You can list 2013 projects in the 2014 Plan.

Chair Lohman: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Easton: How about add to this in a way that's distinguishable from the remainder of the Plan? Because they're currently already listed. We're just asking for a way that they're – we want them highlighted.

Mr. Greenwood: Well, they're not listed in the tables at all. They're omitted.

Mr. Easton: They're omitted from the tables so we're adding them to the tables. Well, then that should be – then that's adequate. Is that adequate?

Mr. Greenwood: Just having them listed? Yes.

Mr. Easton: Do you want to add the word "tables"?

Mr. Greenwood: No, that's fine.

Mr. Easton: Okay.

Mr. Greenwood: Can I keep going?

Mr. Easton: Okay.

Mr. Greenwood: I think it's helpful to see summaries of tables when there's values associated with it. I know that there's holes in those because you're getting numbers from a variety of people, from a bunch of different departments and things like that. Sometimes they guess and sometimes they have real good numbers and sometimes they duplicate maybe. So 3 acres plus 10 acres – you know, it could be a very small number sometimes but – and sometimes they seem irrelevant, but I'd like to see a summary of square footage or acres. And when you sort them by County-owned versus non-County-owned then it makes sense, because if they're just alphabetized in the table then it's – you know, we've got –

Mr. Easton: Didn't you just address that number 10?

Mr. Greenwood: – 100,000 acres. Um, no.

Mr. Easton: So you want a separate line item ___?

Chair Lohman: One is a financial summary.

Mr. Greenwood: Right. This is just – the tables that are existing they've listed County-owned properties and there's no –

Mr. Easton: So then number 12 would read something like that summaries be included where helpful to clarify the – to clarify?

Ms. Radcliffe: We've included a bottom line summary of –

Mr. Greenwood: Oh, you did?

Ms. Radcliffe: – most of the tables, especially the ones that were longer that included revenues versus our assets. So I'm not sure if there's a specific table that was lacking a summary that you were hoping to see.

Mr. Greenwood: I didn't see very many.

Mr. Walters: The total row – is that what we're talking about?

Mr. Greenwood: Yeah. Just totals – adding totals to the bottom.

Mr. Walters: The total row?

Ms. Radcliffe: Yeah.

Mr. Greenwood: Yeah.

Mr. Walters: Yeah.

Mr. Greenwood: I think it was usually called “total columns,” because you had –

Mr. Walters: Oh, right. It’s the row across the top _____ the column.

Mr. Greenwood: – like acres and then at the bottom you’ve got a total of acres, square feet – that sort of thing, dependent upon whether it was fire pumpers or that sort of thing. Total dollars when there’s dollars associated with it. And that would allow us to compare from year to year. We might have holes in it. We might say, Shoot, how come it’s going so wildly? It might just be because of our shotgun approach of collecting information. Sometimes it’s inadequate. But that’s okay. At least it gives us some numbers to look at.

Mr. Easton: So do you want to give her some language to address it?

Mr. Greenwood: I think she’s got it in the totals. We were talking about the columns, right? The numbers – totaling numbers – no, I guess not. This is different.

Ms. Radcliffe: Are you talking about number 10?

Mr. Easton: No, I think he’s got it – I think it’s a different one.

Chair Lohman: It *is* different.

Mr. Greenwood: Summarize – tabular summaries – summarization where totals are helpful. Square foot, acres, for example – dollars.

Mr. Easton: Ah, the quest to make it more real.

Mr. Greenwood: Yep. And I guess my last one is – you know, I had a question about the growth projection assumption numbers and the answer came back that they have to be consistent with the – our Comprehensive Plan projections. And as we’re going along in this process, I mean, we’re using numbers that we already have today and we still have this linear progression of projected based upon a 2000-2050, and if we – and I think it was great. I saw a nice table or chart that showed that maybe it’s not on the trajectory that we thought it was. And if we keep planning and buying and doing based upon those projections when we already have new and improved information, I think it’s a mistake. So I would rather, when we have a real number when we’re doing an update and a projection, maybe you’ll have to put it on the side or something but say, This is actual. Put an actual number when you have an actual one rather than a projected number, because I couldn’t – I tried to fit a formula to the table and I had a hard time with the linear equation to it. Anyway, but I do think that having accurate population projection numbers allows us to project properly. And I know that consistency’s important, but we’re talking about adopting a capital facilities

plan for the Parks and Rec and they used new numbers in their population projections, and I think that's really essential because if, for example, a whole bunch of – we put in a Nike store up here, maybe we've got a whole bunch of Nike employees and our recreation and trails becomes even more necessary.

Chair Lohman: So you're basically saying that you want to have adjustments as real data comes in?

Mr. Greenwood: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Do actual population adjustments to the document as data is acquired.

Ms. Radcliffe: So as the Plan gets updated annually we would include for that Plan the most recent population data.

Mr. Greenwood: Right. I'd like it in this one but –

Kevin Meenaghan: Can I ask a question?

Chair Lohman: Yes.

Mr. Meenaghan: The comment was made in that supplemental report about adopting these new population projections. And so I guess my question is, What is the process to adopt new population projections? Because that was my only comment.

Mr. Easton: It would be a part of the annual process, wouldn't it?

Mr. Meenaghan: I mean, when do we do that?

Mr. Walters: It's not part of the annual process. The important rule to remember is that GMA requires internal consistency across all the documents. So the Comp Plan is based on the adopted population projections from the last time it was updated, which was 2005. And now the Planning Department is supposed to start working on the 2016 update next year, so maybe as soon as – I don't know – the end of next year – sooner – there will be updated and adopted population projections that are based on real numbers.

Chair Lohman: So you're saying that this Plan then is stuck with the projection and not the real numbers?

Mr. Walters: Oh, yes. This Plan must use numbers that are consistent with the rest of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Easton: But that's as of this day at this at this time, as the Comprehensive Plan is, you can't – it's not a living document in the sense that you can't go back and – I mean, once the Commissioners approve it, assuming they approve it, then that's the day that those numbers are locked in until the next time you – until the Comp Plan update changes the numbers? Until the next six-year update?

Chair Lohman: So are you saying we can't have number 13?

Mr. Walters: What's that?

Chair Lohman: So are you saying we can't –

Mr. Walters: We can add another column with additional – with the actual numbers, but the planning needs to be based on the consistent planning across the entire Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Easton: So, in theory, the County uses the same numbers to project planning across all documents, and then we update them through the Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Walters: Well, you're updating the Comprehensive Plan with the Capital Facilities Plan, but because you're not updating all of the rest of the Comprehensive Plan you'll need to be consistent. Now what we can do is update the entire Comprehensive Plan, which I don't think anyone is suggesting, but we could also just wait till next year when we're going to do it anyway. We can also add – we can add the numbers –

Mr. Greenwood: I'd like to add the numbers.

Mr. Walters: Right.

Chair Lohman: For reference.

Mr. Greenwood: Yes.

Mr. Walters: We can add the columns of the numbers up.

Mr. Easton: Does 13 capture what you were looking for then?

Mr. Greenwood: Yes. That'd be really helpful because, I mean, it's misleading to give people the idea that we're still planning – you know, I change my targets all the time based upon new information. So I think you do, too, and I've heard – Ryan, I think you've told the Commissioners even in relation to Bayview Ridge that maybe we don't need to worry quite so much because it's being addressed already with the population downsizing. So if trends are different than what we had thought they were going to be, there's no reason to change your target that

way. I mean, we're not changing the Plan through anything. We're just putting down some actual numbers that are there. And then we could advise ourselves based upon those real numbers. You know, some business goes out of business around here – you know, the airport no longer available can cause problems in a big way.

Chair Lohman: Was that the end of your suggestions, Keith?

Mr. Greenwood: Yes.

Chair Lohman: I mean, you can jump in again. You're not cut off here!

Mr. Greenwood: No, I think I'm good enough there. That would be helpful to me.

Chair Lohman: Okay, I noticed the majority of your tables had, like, the actual dollar number written out, except for I believe it was the Drainage Utility table. You had to multiply by 1000. I think that when you quote your dollars that you need to be consistent throughout the entire thing – everybody do it the same way. And so I would suggest that that section be the same as the rest.

Ms. Radcliffe: Formatted the same?

Chair Lohman: Yes. Rather than putting a disclaimer at the top – 5000 – let's just put the real number there.

Mr. Greenwood: I'm going to look for a table that does not have a summary for you just for example. On page 28 you've got a County-owned, County-operated Stormwater Management. I think that was one that had a Values. Those Values could be summarized.

Ms. Radcliffe: That was page?

Mr. Greenwood: 28 on your document.

Ms. Radcliffe: All right.

Mr. Easton: Okay. I have an additional comment that doesn't come under Recommendations, Madame Chair, when we're done with the Recommendations section. Can I go to that?

Chair Lohman: Wait. Wait, wait. Did anybody else see anything? Robert? Josh, did you? Matt? Kevin? Elinor, did you see anything else? And I want to make sure everybody has a chance to –

Ms. Nakis: I'm just looking through my notes and I think everything – everything that I had starred was – has been addressed.

Chair Lohman: Jason?

Mr. Easton: So outside of the Recommendation area, I just want to make a note that I also want us to address the fact that in the draft we were credited with adding this additional comments, so I want to make sure that we all understand this is included and if there's any objection to it we should discuss it. Under Additional Comments on the original version we were sent, which is after number 7, it reads: The Planning Commission separately recommends that the County Drainage Utility evaluate and consider solutions to the drainage issues related to the Lake Chiquita – like the banana; actually it doesn't say "like the banana" – Lake Chiquita Bypass system. So that was captured too, because I know that was an issue that came up. But it seems to the staff that that would be better to not be a recommendation that relates directly to the Capital Facilities Plan. It's more a direction for the Utility, so it makes sense to not have it under Recommendations. Go ahead.

Chair Lohman: I think it was an example of things that were revealed because of going through this exercise, and I'm not sure that it's part of the Capital Facilities Plan. It's an additional stand-alone item as a poster child of the problem when you have mandated, developer-required facilities and then something happens and the developer's gone or goes bankrupt or dissolves their LLC or whatever. There's nobody in charge now and there may not be a homeowners association to take it on. It's in limbo, but it's not inventoried because it doesn't belong to the County; it's private. I think – and then we also discussed what I mentioned earlier about roads versus the Drainage Utility – having it on the list – who has it on the list. I think it really needs to be a stand-alone item, separate from the Capital Facilities Plan. That's my personal opinion.

Mr. Easton: So we're going to send it to them as a memo? I mean, how would we –

Chair Lohman: Yeah. I mean, it came up quite a bit because of the exercise that we went through. It shone a flashlight on this problem, and it *is* a problem. Go ahead, Robert.

Mr. Temples: Ryan, what's your take? You've been listening to this the last few weeks.

Mr. Walters: I'm sorry. I actually wasn't listening for the last couple minutes!

(laughter)

Mr. Easton: He wasn't listening for the last couple of minutes. He's –

Mr. Temples: Focus on this!

Mr. Easton: Did something come up in the last couple of minutes that took your attention away?

Chair Lohman: It's election night – he's anxious!

Mr. Walters: A little bit.

Mr. Easton: A little bit?

Mr. Walters: Yeah.

Mr. Temples: We have a private – that's basically what it is – it's a private property issue that's causing drainage issues that are impacting, I believe, its public right-of-ways (sic). Am I wrong?

Several voices: No.

Mr. Temples: Okay. And yet nothing supposedly can be enacted or done because it's not part of the County – the project system. It's private.

Mr. Walters: Well –

Mr. Temples: So what would the County have as a recourse to somehow force some action? Or are you saying we have none?

Mr. Walters: I think Jan may have some comments on that, but basically the answer – and you should feel free to go to the ____ because my comments may not be as coherent as usual – but I think basically the answer to your question is yes, there are always things that the County can do; no, the Capital Facilities Plan is not necessarily the right mechanism to address that.

Mr. Temples: I would probably agree with that.

Mr. Walters: And that's simply because the Capital Facilities Plan is a plan for publicly-held facilities, and if it's not publicly-held then it shouldn't be in the Plan. The – I guess – the segue is it could become publicly-held or it could become managed or the public/the County could assist in its management in some way. And I think Jan would like to expand.

Jan Flagan: Good evening. I'm Jan Flagan. I'm the Surface Water Section Manager for Skagit County Public Works and I also manage the County Drainage Utility. And the Drainage Utility was established to address stormwater issues outside of County road right-of-way, and we fund both corrections to drainage problems and we actually design and construct projects to correct drainage problems countywide. The facilities are funded by a special assessment. So,

Annie, you'd mentioned the conflict between Drainage Utility and grant funding, and that's – if it's grant-funded and it's part of the Drainage Utility program it's considered a capital facility within the Drainage Utility program. If it's privately constructed and funded – for example, a stormwater system for a plat – that is not a County capital facility; however, the Drainage Utility funds are available for correcting drainage concerns outside County road right-of-way that impact, you know, drainage, privately-owned systems that impact privately-owned properties or County facilities. We've done a number of Drainage Utility projects that impact both private properties and County road systems. And the funding – the capital facilities list are those projects that are County-constructed facilities funded by the Drainage Utility.

Mr. Greenwood: So where's that money for those other projects come from?

Ms. Flagan: For the privately-constructed projects? It'd be a development cost.

Mr. Greenwood: No, but you said you help out.

Ms. Flagan: Okay, when we help out we correct drainage problems – you know, the example came up with the Lake Chiquita Bypass. And I wrote a letter to Carol recently and I said that the Drainage Utility program has the drainage complaint system so if we get a complaint with a drainage issue we go out and we investigate it. We try and determine the source. We try and come up with a solution and we construct the solution with Drainage Utility funds. So it's – the funds are available for work on these private capital – private systems, but they are not County capital facilities.

Mr. Greenwood: But I guess I'm still asking where the money comes from. Is it just –

Ms. Flagan: It's a special assessment.

Mr. Greenwood: On who?

Ms. Flagan: Property owners throughout the county, with the exception of those within drainage districts, incorporated cities, federal and tribal lands, and commercial timberlands. But everybody pays. You look at your tax statement and you have a Drainage Utility assessment. The average rate for a single-family residence is, like, \$48, 50 a year.

Mr. Temples: So how do we correct this problem?

Ms. Flagan: Well, it's not a problem in my eyes, because if we've got drainage concerns with the system we can address those, and we do hundreds of those every year. We –

Mr. Temples: So how does this one get on your docket, your list?

Ms. Flagan: Well, I talked to Carol about coming in. You know, we have a procedure that we go through. We get a complaint in; we fill out a form; we do an investigation; we check to make sure that the property's in the Drainage Utility assessment area; we – Nicky Davis on my staff goes out and she talks with local property owners to try and see – determine the source of the problem; come up with a solution. If it's a quick, easy fix often my road crews will, you know, like, clean a ditch or vector a culvert catch basin. Those are things that we do in-house pretty routinely. If it's a larger project or it's a more regional problem we will develop a project and come up with a solution. You know, the South Fidalgo Stormwater Plan –

Chair Lohman: Matt? Excuse me.

Ms. Flagan: Okay.

Mr. Mahaffie: Madame Chair, we're in the middle of deliberations for Capital Facilities _____.

Mr. Temples: Yeah, _____.

Chair Lohman: I agree.

Ms. Flagan: Okay.

Mr. Easton: Point of order. Well put.

Chair Lohman: I agree. We're getting into the weeds.

Ms. Flagan: Okay.

Chair Lohman: Thank you.

Mr. Easton: So I mean I'm comfortable – as the maker of the motion – I'm comfortable with removing it, if that makes the rest of the Commission more comfortable with this.

Mr. Temples: Until the document's updated.

Ms. Nakis: So basically what you're saying to us is that this is going to be a concern that's being addressed. I mean, it *is* being addressed at this point?

Ms. Flagan: Right. We will address this concern.

Chair Lohman: But it has really nothing to do with the Capital Facilities list.

Mr. Walters: That's right.

Ms. Flagan: No, it doesn't. You know, that's my concern is that these private facilities not be confused with the capital facilities.

Chair Lohman: Thank you, Jan.

Mr. Easton: I've got to do an amendment to the motion anyway, so I'll address it in the amendment.

Ms. Ehlers: Whitecap Lane is on the Utility and it was done exactly the same way.

Chair Lohman: Matt?

Mr. Mahaffie: It's either a capital facility or it's not. We're off-topic.

Mr. Easton: Right.

Chair Lohman: Right. I agree. Robert?

Mr. Easton: Is that –

Mr. Temples: Okay.

Mr. Easton: Are you ready for another amendment?

Mr. Temples: Yep.

Mr. Easton: I'm going to make an amendment to address the additions since the motions I made didn't address the additions, and then I will also address in my amendment that will also remove this comment. So I make an amendment to the original motion to add – could you scroll up for me? – to add items – under Recommendations – to add items number 8 through number 14 and to strike from the Recommendations – below the Recommendations – the additional comment – a sentence there on 4 – to strike that section. Strike from “Additional Comments” through to “systems.” I make that in the form of an amendment to the original motion.

Chair Lohman: Do we have a second?

Mr. Mahaffie(?): Sure. Why not?

Chair Lohman: Okay, it's moved and seconded to adopt items 8 through 14 and to strike the section called “Additional Comments.” All those – discussion?

Mr. Easton: It's obvious.

Chair Lohman: Any more discussion?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Okay.

Ms. Nakis: I have a question about this. I mean, I don't have those notes from our last meeting, but as I remember the Lake Chiquita Bypass and where that drains into a private property, but what has drained into that because of the nature of the bypass, I guess –

Mr. Easton: It's a point of order issue. The majority of the Commission – or some of the Commission do not feel that addressing Lake Chiquita at this point in this document – so if you want to do it separately, I'm open to that. But addressing it here –

Ms. Nakis: Okay.

Mr. Easton: So the details of what you're talking about just doesn't seem to fit on this document. When we go to our next order of business, I think which is when we get to make our own comments and stuff, we could make recommendations to staff then or suggestions and maybe we can address it there. But I agree with the Chair that it's –

Chair Lohman: In the context of the Capital Facilities Plan it doesn't fit.

Ms. Nakis: Okay. All right.

Chair Lohman: But it doesn't mean that we don't think there's a problem there that should be addressed somehow, some way. It's just we're here to deliberate the Capital Facilities Plan. This is kind of like a – it doesn't belong.

Ms. Nakis: Okay.

Mr. Easton: But there're just times that when we deliberate on – or when we hear a hearing on something we're going to find out about something that doesn't relate directly to the document that we're working on, so we just have to address it, I think, where it fits and it doesn't seem to fit here.

Ms. Nakis: Okay.

Chair Lohman: So are we ready to vote? All those in favor, say "aye."

Mr. Easton, Mr. Axthelm, Ms. Nakis, Mr. Temples, Mr. Meenaghan, Chair Lohman, Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Mahaffie: Aye.

Mr. Easton: Clarification: We're voting on the amendment first and then on the motion?

Chair Lohman: Yes.

Mr. Temples: I, too, have a question.

Chair Lohman: Robert? We haven't voted yet.

Mr. Temples: Okay. We have asked for all this additional information and clarification. Don't we need that back to us before we vote on this?

Mr. Easton: We're making a recommendation to the Commissioners. The way I made the motion is that it's a recommendation to the Commissioners that they instruct staff to do these things. So we wouldn't in this case review those – _____ from here.

Mr. Temples: Oh, so we sign it and everything after the review is done.

Mr. Easton: We're asking the Commissioners to ask the staff to do additional work as part of our recommendations.

Mr. Temples: Okay.

Chair Lohman: Yeah.

Mr. Temples: Okay, thank you for the clarification.

Mr. Easton: History shows that they don't always take our recommendations, but sometimes they do.

Mr. Greenwood: If it's a holdup – I mean, if it's one of those things that if I don't get this I don't support it, then you can vote that way.

Mr. Easton: Well, you can obviously vote against the motion for the amendment.

Mr. Greenwood: Right. Right.

Mr. Easton: But it's just from a process point. These are just recommendations so we wouldn't – great question, though – because we're not going to review this additional work.

Mr. Greenwood: Right. Although I'm looking for this information so that the next time around I've got something that's more helpful for me.

Mr. Easton: Side by side.

Mr. Greenwood: Yes, and this will help.

Chair Lohman: But remember we're advisory.

Mr. Greenwood: Yep.

Chair Lohman: Okay. Are we ready to vote? Are we all ready? Okay, all those in favor, say "aye."

Mr. Easton, Ms. Nakis, Mr. Temples, Mr. Axthelm, Mr. Meenaghan, Chair Lohman and Mr. Mahaffie: Aye.

Chair Lohman: All those opposed, say "nay."

(silence)

Mr. Easton: Now call the question for the whole thing.

Chair Lohman: Okay, now we're going to vote on the entire Capital Facilities Plan with all of these additional changes. So all those in favor, say "aye."

Mr. Walters: That vote should be a roll call vote.

Mr. Easton: Oh. Okay.

Chair Lohman: So just go down the list? So we'll start with this end of the table. Robert?

Mr. Temples: Yes.

Mr. Axthelm: Yes.

Chair Lohman: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Yes.

Mr. Mahaffie: Yes.

Mr. Meenaghan: Yes.

Mr. Greenwood: Yes.

Ms. Nakis: Yes.

Chair Lohman: And we have Commissioner Dave Hughes absent. So, are we finished? Okay, now we are on item number 5 on our agenda. I know – I'm five or six minutes past 8:30. Okay, Department Update.

Mr. Johnson: As I mentioned earlier, Dale's not here and I'm really not prepared or in a position to give a Department update. So unless Ryan or Gary has something to add, I think we're done, from the Department's perspective.

Chair Lohman: Okay, any comments from the Planning Commissioners? I have one and that is I really, really like the interactive agenda where you have imbedded online where you can leap to the supplemental materials for the meeting. I love that. I think it was a really great deal. And I really like that you included the Google Earth-type-looking maps where they're like the aerial view and they show the real life footprint of what's going on on that property. I thought both those things were very beneficial and I really wanted to pass that on and thank you.

Ms. Nakis: Mm-hmm, absolutely. Thank you.

Mr. Easton: I want to add that four of the Commissioners were here today which is tough to get here in the middle of the day – to celebrate Carol's getting a really cool plaque. But I saw something that I don't think I'll ever see again when any of us step down – even Dave. I'm not sure. But Carol had the honor of having over fifteen staff members leave their desks without being asked to come, and so I just think that says so much about her twenty-five years of service. And for those of you who couldn't come, go catch the fifteen minutes of it on TV. It's on tape on the website. But it was really awesome and I'm very, very proud of the way she was celebrated and so we will miss her service, although I've noticed that she likes to testify now so we'll probably see her quite a bit.

(laughter)

Mr. Easton: It was awesome.

Chair Lohman: Okay, any motions to adjourn?

Mr. Temples and Ms. Nakis: I'll make a motion.

(gavel)

Ms. Nakis: Okay, I'll second it.

Chair Lohman: (gavel) Adjourned.