

**Skagit County Planning Commission
Deliberations: Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
May 10, 2016**

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

Staff: Dale Pernula, Planning Director
Ryan Walters, Assistant Planning Director
Kirk Johnson, Senior Planner
Jill Dvorkin, Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

Public Remarks

Commenters: Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County
Carol Ehlers

Others: John Coleman, City of Sedro-Woolley Planning Director

Chair Josh Axthelm: (gavel) It's Tuesday, May 10th. Welcome to our Planning Commission meeting. We call this meeting to order. Do the Commissioners have any comments – do the Commissioners have any comments for the agenda?

(silence)

Chair Axthelm: Okay, seeing none, we'll go ahead and move on to the first portion of the agenda, which is the Public Remarks. And the public will be reminded that – let's see, I should read it once in a while.

This time is on the agenda for the opportunity for anyone to speak to the Planning Commission about any topic except those items scheduled on the agenda for a public hearing that same day or items that had a public hearing and are still under Planning Commission deliberations. Public remarks, which is not part of the formal public participation process for any development regulation or Comprehensive Plan amendment project, is limited to three minutes per speaker and up to 15 minutes total. Thank you.

Ellen Bynum: Good evening, Commissioners. Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County. My two questions are concerning the process of both the CAC that was appointed by the BoCC for the Comp Plan. Have you – is the Planning Commission planning to meet as the CAC, or what

happened to that? Citizens advisory committee was supposed to be appointed by the Board, right? And in lieu they appointed you, so I don't know how you're going to deal with that. That's just a procedural question that I had for the staff and for the Commissioners.

And my second question also has to do with the confusion that was put forth last meeting about what happens to the Shoreline Master Program when it's approved by DOE. As we understand it, the Department of Ecology had a legal requirement to update the Shoreline Master Program and they required that the County do that, and Skagit County began that process. It appointed a citizen advisory committee and then it began working on drafting the Shoreline Master Program. And then that has now come before you. There was some confusion whether you would then be seeing that again after it came back from Department of Ecology if it was changed. As we understand it – and Dale and Ryan can speak to this – the final draft goes before you; you recommend to the Board of County Commissioners; the Board of County Commissioners then sends it to the Department of Ecology, and that is a final ruling, whatever Department of Ecology does. The Board may come back and adopt that, but that is the way that we understand it. If you raise an appeal on what went to the Department of Ecology to the Growth Management Hearings Board, you do that after that appeal is final. So we're quite concerned about the public process being fully understood by everybody, including people who own shoreline properties, and we just wanted to make that statement for the record. Thanks.

Chair Axthelm: Thank you.

Carol Ehlers: Carol Ehlers, west Fidalgo Island. Since you have been preventing any public remarks for the last part of the process, I am very pleased that you decided today we could have one, and I have two regarding process that are quite serious. If you look at your agenda today, it says that Planning Commissioners should review the Department memo and associated documents and public comments on the 2016 Update webpage. You don't have the transcript for the hearing on that webpage. That means that de facto the hearing was not – wasn't. It's mandated under Growth Management that those people who are reviewing documents have to read every single thing that comes before you. If there are 588 pages in a set of documents, you have to read them all. If there are 350 pages in the comments, you have to read them and the poor soul who has to respond to them also has to read through them, and he needs time too. You have had, as I've added it up, more than 1600 pages to read in the last couple of months. That's a heavy dose. And you told us you were going to do certain chapters. You did a sensible thing and added some remarks in other chapters, which some are good, some have a problem attached to it.

I would like an extension. I would like you, the Planning Commission, to ask for an extension. And I raised the question with the County Commissioners this morning and if you're willing to do it they are willing to consider it. I'm requesting this as much for the public and the process as for you and for Kirk and anyone trying to respond, because it has to be done right. We have to live under these rules and principles. We have to live safely. It has to be fair. More than a year ago, I was called as a witness in a court case and sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and the judge wouldn't let me tell the whole truth. That was a heavy lesson in due process and I don't want anything like that to happen with you folks, because for 30 years the Planning Commission has insisted that things be done according to due process. And I'm trying my best in what I have done and turned in to enable you to see things that I know of that other people may not know of. We've all done that. So thanks for the enormous amount of effort I know you're putting in. And please get that transcript on the legal website. It's on the web under the Planning Commission. That is not the page that I'm showing you here, which is where it has to be.

Chair Axthelm: Thank you, Carol.

Ms. Ehlers: This page is dated the 9th of May because that's when I copied it off.

Chair Axthelm: Thank you. Are there any other comments from the public?

(silence)

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Seeing none, we'll move on to the next section on the agenda, the Deliberations on the Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update for the public hearing. If you will turn to your Supplemental Staff Report, I think the County Commissioners had some suggestions on how to proceed. Going along with that, I did see the hearing – or the meeting they had earlier today where Carol had talked to the Commissioners, and they did, indeed – as a matter of fact, I have it on the computer. The video was already put up. And it said that if we didn't feel like we had the information that we needed and if we didn't feel like we were able to have the time to review it that they wanted to make sure that we had the time to review that information. So it's your opportunity. If you feel like you didn't have the opportunity to review all the information or that it wasn't complete or anything was missing, now would be that time. So does anybody have any issues with proceeding?

(silence)

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Kathy Mitchell: Well, I don't know if it's an issue with proceeding, but I do believe that there was a big wealth of information and a lot of reading material, and it does take a lot of extra time. I just want to make sure everybody did have the adequate time to go through it where they feel comfortable moving forward. That's just the one request to know.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. We do have a lot of information to cover, so if there are some things that you feel like you didn't have an adequate time to review, then we could put those towards another week if we needed to. So, otherwise, we could proceed with the things we know on. It's not a hearing. It's not evidently – I mean, from my understanding, I didn't see any information that was omitted from a hearing situation, but for us to have the time to review – unless you saw anything. Okay.

Tammy Candler: I would comment that I don't feel ready to proceed on the Sedro-Woolley UGA, and the reason I'm bringing it up is I see Mr. Coleman's here and we're not going to address that maybe. We could decide that earlier rather than later.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. That's one of the things the Commissioners had brought up is to have first on the agenda because he is here tonight. There was a request from one of the Commissioners to help clarify that and understand a little bit better of what they were asking for. He did give information in our work session and hearing – or hearing, but there were some questions, enough to bring him here. You're saying you'd *not* like to do that or you would?

Ms. Candler: I don't feel like I've had a chance to review as much of some of the Sedro-Woolley proposal as I'd like to. I don't know if anyone else feels that way.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ryan Walters: Mr. Chairman?

Chair Axthelm: Yeah?

Mr. Walters: I would suggest that we proceed with the process of outlining the memo – number one, asking questions. Because we do have that opportunity up front, which might include the ability to ask questions of Mr. Coleman. And then issue identification, and after you identify the issues you can organize the issues and schedule them whenever you think is appropriate.

Chair Axthelm: Yeah. Okay. All right, so the first item is questions – not arguments necessarily for the individual items on the Comprehensive Plan, but just general questions on it. Why don't we just go ahead and run down the line and see if anybody has questions that come to mind, and then if we need to go back through again we can.

Martha Rose: Earlier this evening, Kathy and I were discussing the provision that had to do with the quantity of water that a household might use for the purposes of sizing a rainwater catchment. And so it's not so much a question as a point of interest for me because I feel like the amount of water that is required to be stored is excessive. So at any rate, I don't know if that's the kind of question you're talking about. That's an issue that I want to see us address and talk about.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. This is just general.

Ms. Rose: Just general.

Chair Axthelm: At first, just general questions on the Comprehensive Plan or any of the process as far as just general questions, and then we can start going in to it and start laying out the –

Ms. Rose: – the issues.

Chair Axthelm: – the issues. Yep.

Ms. Rose: Okay. I don't think I have any questions yet.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Down the line here – Tim?

Tim Raschko: No.

Chair Axthelm: And ___ the names right now. Kath – it's –

Kathi Jett: Kathi.

Chair Axthelm: It is Kathi. Okay.

Ms. Jett: No.

Several Commissioners: No.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. All right. So then we can go ahead and just go into the – to break it down. So what they say in number 2 is just to lay it out and identify the issues. They've got some

issues written for us already on the next page just to start it out – some items that they had anticipated. But if there are items that you would like to add to that list, let's run through that.

Annie Lohman: So starting with the rural growth allocation – is that what you mean?

Chair Axthelm: Yeah. So like on this list here, we have the Comp Plan, the Zoning Map, the Process, and the Development Regulations.

Ms. Mitchell: Page 3 of the staff report, number one, if anybody else is looking for it.

Mr. Walters: Yeah, this is the time just to identify all the things you want to talk about during deliberations. On the following page of the staff report, we tried to group the public comments into logical groupings, but maybe you don't want to talk about those or maybe you want to talk about other items. Like we did with Shoreline, if you identify – you go down the row and identify all the issues you want to talk about, I'll type them on the screen. We'll have a list. And unlike Shoreline, we'll be able to print that list and hand it to you. But once we've got the list, we'll organize them in some logical groupings of the issues you want to talk about and then schedule them because we have at least two meetings to talk about this, maybe more, so we can order them in order of importance or whatever order we might want to take them. The first task is to get the list of things you want to talk about.

Chair Axthelm: Is there anything that the Planning Department wants to add to this list? Issues that – you'd mentioned about the transportation.

Mr. Walters: We have – we don't know about transportation yet. There may be a math error or some substantiation error in the Transportation Appendix. We will have more information next week.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, and so that's one of the items that they've asked us to do is to have the transportation portion of it go towards next week and have us start out with the – with Sedro-Woolley. But, other than that, we can add the rest of the things in right now if we'd like to.

Ms. Lohman: What is the suggested order that you want to go, Mr. Chairman?

Chair Axthelm: I think just going by those items – by the list that they have there. Well, and you – if you want to add more to it.

Ms. Mitchell: Can I make a suggestion that worked for us before?

Chair Axthelm: Yeah.

Ms. Mitchell: At this stage, just run down the list and have anybody throw anything else onto the list, and then we can reorder. You were able to do that pretty easily last time, right?

Chair Axthelm: Yeah, and that's what I'm getting at – not that I said it that way! So let's just go ahead and start at the end of the row – down here, Tammy, if you'd like to start.

Several Commissioners: That's Hollie.

Chair Axthelm: Or Hollie. I'm sorry.

Hollie Del Vecchio: I guess the only thing that I noticed maybe would fall under one of the subject areas, but I believe there was some public comment asking for a citizens advisory committee of some sort. I think it was – the request was specific, I think, to transportation, but I think that's something – I don't know if it goes – I'd put it under process, although I think staff is looking at process a little bit differently. But anyway, I just would want to make sure that that's included somewhere.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Mr. Walters: If we could switch the camera to the staff table, I'll put them on your screens.

Ms. Mitchell: Thank you.

Kirk Johnson: Could I ask a clarification – if that's a citizen advisory committee related to transportation or just a broad citizen advisory committee?

Ms. Del Vecchio: Oh, I think that's part of the – that would be part of the discussion.

Mr. Johnson: Okay.

Ms. Del Vecchio: I think that there's some clear – to me there would be some clear need in transportation, but it seems like open space might have some need there as well. And maybe it would be one committee or – so I guess I would want the discussion to be a little bit broader than transportation just in case there's interest in having it focus on some other areas.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ms. Candler: I don't have anything to add at this time.

Chair Axthelm: Kathy?

Ms. Mitchell: I put some questions in to Dale and staff earlier – general questions about understanding the sewer availability for the Edison issues. Just for clarification there so people understand the reasoning for how sewer works there. It can be brief.

And put another tick next to the citizen advisory committee, please.

Towards the bottom of the list, put a – I'd like to talk about the junk vehicles and RVs and recreation vehicles.

A new thing I'd like for people to consider, just like we did on the Shoreline thing, would be adding a policy regarding trailhead mark – emergency markers or addresses or something like that.

Yeah, I was going to say what's not on – I'm not seeing on the list – is Raspberry Ridge either.

Ms. Lohman: It's the Burlington UGA.

Ms. Mitchell: Just Burlington UGA, if we're going to cover it that way. Okay.

Tell me if anybody else is seeing – missing it, but the – making sure that information is in the appendices ____ historic data. Is that on the list here, in other words? Because I'm not seeing it if it is.

Also in regards to when we get to discussions about open space and trails, do food security.

And then a brief discussion on well metering for Guemes.

Chair Axthelm: Ryan, do you have the ability to print this when you're done?

Mr. Walters: Yeah.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ms. Mitchell: Oh, one other thing. Again, if I'm not seeing it here, somebody correct me. In regards to the 11 trail items that were discussed before.

Mr. Walters: What are those?

Ms. Mitchell: It was the 11 trail items on the Technical Appendix. So that goes way under – whenever we get to the transportation.

Mr. Johnson: The non-motorized projects?

Ms. Mitchell: Yeah, the non-motorized transportation.

Mr. Johnson: The 20-year plan, but not on the six-year TIP.

Ms. Mitchell: That'll do it. Thank you.

Chair Axthelm: Annie?

Ms. Lohman: Okay, pretty much all of the things that are already on there are the same things that I have issues with. But I got an awful lot of interesting conversations with people on the Transportation Appendix because it's not very much comfort to people when it's told that it's just a concept, just creating these lists. Because there's an awful lot of public process that needs to be going on, and when you're talking about putting trails in agriculture there's an awful lot of situations and maybe what appears to be something isn't something, or the availability of something. So there was quite a bit of concern about just because a virtue of being on a list and then all of a sudden it's added to a Comp Plan, and it kind of seems to create premature legs because it's a concept.

Mr. Walters: So a reminder to just identify issues –

Ms. Lohman: Yes, but I wanted to explain why. So – but other than that, I am – I think this is a good breakout.

Chair Axthelm: Kathi?

Ms. Jett: I have nothing additional to add.

Chair Axthelm: Tim?

Mr. Raschko: No, I have nothing to add.

Amy Hughes: Nothing to add.

Ms. Rose: Everything I want is on the list, one or the other. Yep.

Mr. Walters: Okay, so let me clarify. Do you also want to talk about all the other things on the staff grouping of the public comments?

Ms. Mitchell: Yes.

Chair Axthelm: Are you talking the answers?

Ms. Candler: Are you asking if there's anything we want deleted?

Mr. Walters: Right.

Ms. Lohman: Well, I thought they were kind of the meat of what we were going to talk about, and kind of leading in to what we were going to talk about.

Mr. Walters: Well, they may be. Last time we put tick marks next to the ones that people did want to talk about and there were some, I think, that people just didn't.

Ms. Lohman: But keep in mind, too, you know, when we – there's other people that maybe they're not aware of the process that we're going through. So you always have a small minority that is actively engaged in process, so just because somebody didn't necessarily identify it doesn't mean that we shouldn't make sure that we cover it.

Ms. Del Vecchio: But the categories that you have here are all things that *were* addressed by public comment.

Mr. Walters: Yeah.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Right. And that's where – I feel if it was addressed by public comment, we should be at least talking about that. There might be more things as we go through that we decide to add, but I wouldn't want to take anything off the list if it was raised by public comment.

Ms. Mitchell: Same here.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. So we want to go down through the list as well for the public comment items, additional to –

Ms. Del Vecchio: And now what are we doing?

Chair Axthelm: No, I mean with the – we have the key issues but do we – we want to go down through the public comments and just verify that we don't have any other additional concerns on those? In the end. I have a couple of things that I wanted to add to that, Ryan.

Ms. Mitchell: Oh, yeah. We didn't get Josh.

Chair Axthelm: I'm sure you've heard them before. One was property rights, and public access, and – I'm not ahead of you too far, am I? – integration of the Open Space Concept Plan, how it is. Is it part of the – is it part of the Comprehensive Plan or is it being attached as a – just a reference? So are we approving that document as well?

And then I just – the comments that they made at the beginning, just have those – if you could address those as well.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Ryan, we can't see the screen. Is that something that you're able to do on your end?

Mr. Walters: Yeah. All right, so this is quite the list now so we may want _____.

Chair Axthelm: Did you get my items on there?

Mr. Walters: Yes.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. And then also the process comments that were made at the beginning.

Mr. Walters: Well, I didn't get those.

Mr. Johnson: Ryan, before you print that, sewer for Edison, I think, seems logical to consider that with the map amendments because that's really why we're talking about Edison sewer.

Mr. Walters: That's true. I figured we'll make quite a few changes after _____.

Mr. Johnson: Okay.

Ms. Mitchell: I think we're going to do a general reorder, for anybody that's wondering what we're doing. We're throwing out the ideas first and then we're going to put them in an order that we want to address them.

Chair Axthelm: So did you get, as far as process, the citizens advisory committee and the transcript issue?

Mr. Walters: No, but to the extent those are questions, we could just answer those right now if you want.

Chair Axthelm: Well, that's fine. I just wanted to make sure they were on the list.

Mr. Walters: They are not on the list.

Ms. Candler: The citizens advisory is.

Mr. Walters: Yeah, ones that you guys mentioned are on the list. I didn't write down any of the things from before.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ms. Del Vecchio: There is some overlap from –

Mr. Walters: I don't recall exactly what –

Ms. Del Vecchio: I mean, it looks like some of those comments were actually submitted as written comments because it seems like we do have generally some of those issues raised there. But I think it was the specific questions that we didn't add to the list that I would personally – would be helpful to get answers on.

Ms. Mitchell: Do you feel like you need to add those to the list? Would that make you more comfortable now?

Ms. Del Vecchio: No.

Ms. Mitchell: Okay.

Chair Axthelm: Commissioners, take a minute while he's getting that ready to print. If we'd look through the comments and the responses, if there's anything that you see that we need to add to that list – big items.

Ms. Jett: Josh, I have a question. It was my understanding that we were going to go through and discuss each one of these items? Okay. They aren't always listed on this – like open space isn't listed out here, but that doesn't matter?

Chair Axthelm: No.

Ms. Jett: Thank you.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, so do you want to answer that question as far as the –

Mr. Walters: Who knows? It might be that we never get to print.

Ms. Lohman: Can you just email it to us?

Mr. Johnson: Or you could email it to me and I could go print at my desk.

Ms. Mitchell: One of the things that was in the staff report responding to the comment – public comments – was the eminent domain, and I'm not – am I just missing it? I'm not seeing it on the main list.

Mr. Johnson: A lot of the – okay, I think eminent domain came under transportation.

Ms. Mitchell: Okay.

Mr. Johnson: And so a lot of things were rolled up into broader categories.

Ms. Mitchell: All right. If that's the case, I would just like to make sure that that subset was included and we don't – that if you guys would tick it for us so we don't miss it by mistake.

Chair Axthelm: I say we just add it as a line item, just in case, even though it's under transportation. Just make sure that way that discussion comes up.

Ms. Mitchell: Yeah, I don't want to miss that.

Chair Axthelm: You made it look longer. It's a lot of stuff – two-liners!

Mr. Walters: No, I just wanted it to fit on one page.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Kathy, you were saying about adding one more?

Ms. Mitchell: Yeah, make sure eminent domain's in there so we don't miss it under transportation.

Chair Axthelm: Under which section? Oh, just under CPP – under the Comp Plan?

Ms. Mitchell: Yeah, whenever we hit the Transportation Element, so a subset of transportation.

Mr. Walters: I've grouped these into Plan Policies, Plan Map, and Development Regulations.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Does that work for the Commissioners to have them in this grouping? Or would you like to see them broken down any differently?

Mr. Walters: Oh, and Process the fourth category.

Ms. Candler: I'm okay with it.

Chair Axthelm: If we're okay with that, then we'll go ahead and proceed. Okay. So as far as order, again the Commissioners requested that we have the Sedro-Woolley up front. I'm sorry – not the Sedro-Woolley. The discussion but have at least – do you want to do a partial while he's here to get some questions answered and then finish it up next time?

Ms. Candler: If the rest of the Commission wants to do that, that's fine. I am not – I don't feel like I am ready to deliberate on it and I think that – my personal preference if it was just me and no one else would be to let Mr. Coleman know that we're not ready to deal with it and he could not be here this whole time. But if other people have questions for him that they're ready for, that's fine too.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Mr. Johnson: If I could interject, we specifically asked Mr. Coleman to be here. We had to make a decision in terms of lining people up to be here what would be considered, or at least what questions would be asked tonight versus what would be asked next Tuesday. So we've talked to Public Works and SCOG folks about being here next Tuesday for transportation. Dale talked to John Coleman about being here tonight for Sedro-Woolley. And so we were thinking of proposing – maybe you're not to that point yet – that you consider the map amendments as a group tonight and then move on to the Comp Plan either when you finish those tonight or at the start of the next meeting. So I don't mean to be butting into the process. I haven't been through this new process with you all, but that's kind of why he's here tonight.

Chair Axthelm: Typically we don't have somebody here to explain things. We just deliberate on it. So if he gives us an explanation and then we postpone the rest of it till next time, does that feel comfortable at least?

Ms. Candler: Sure.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. I don't want to waste his time while he's here, and if we get the information then at least you have more to go off of. Okay. Let's format the list. So do we want to make any changes to the order of the list of how it is right now?

Mr. Walters: So I've arranged things a little bit. I put the Edison issues together with the Edison map amendment. Sewer for Edison is there together with the Edison map amendment. I put the transportation items underneath the Transportation Element that was already listed.

Chair Axthelm: I don't think we're picking you up on the microphone.

Mr. Walters: Transportation items are under transportation there. Food security: Is that part of open space?

Ms. Mitchell: Yes.

Mr. Walters: Yeah. Is Integration of Open Space Plan part of open space?

Ms. Del Vecchio: It'd be a good guess. Probably trail head markers, too.

Ms. Mitchell: Mm-hmm.

Chair Axthelm: Commissioners, this whole process here, at least ____, we can just keep it open and just go through and propose, or –

Mr. Walters: Are these two part of open space – property rights, public access?

Chair Axthelm: Yes, I would think so. Yep. They could hit other areas but at least that's to be addressed under that.

Ms. Mitchell: If that's the case, though, for anybody that had any issues with those, just remember that we – that other people may have put those in for another reason, too.

Mr. Walters: Well, I tried to put initials after them so we could track who's – who is concerned about what.

Ms. Mitchell: Yeah, thank you.

Mr. Walters: All right, so I'm going to put "map amendments" at the top of the list here so that you at least can begin with Sedro-Woolley UGA. What about the other map amendments? Do you want to proceed with them first or later?

Ms. Mitchell: I'd like to see them up front.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, sounds good. I'd like to see one more added to the list. Just under "rural development" down there is "urban development." Kathy, anything else?

Ms. Mitchell: I've got a – yeah, I've got a question, and I'm sorry for not asking this under Process earlier but it didn't occur to me. If we can hit those big – I'm going to call them "quasi-

judicial,” for lack of knowing what they really are, like the Erie Trucking and the UGA – those different issues. If you –

Mr. Walters: Map amendments.

Ms. Mitchell: Map amendments – thank you. If we put those up front and make decisions and recommendations on those, if for some strange reason we get bogged in other stuff elsewhere can they be pushed ahead to the Board?

Mr. Walters: No.

Ms. Mitchell: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, Annie? Another one?

Ms. Lohman: No.

Chair Axthelm: Tim?

Mr. Raschko: I’m good.

Chair Axthelm: All right, so it looks like we’re good with it. Is that all right? Any other comments for it? And it doesn’t mean we can’t add more stuff to the list if we need to, but it’s just at least right now this gets us started.

Mr. Walters: Do you want to take these Process issues before the substance, or in the middle where they are now?

Ms. Lohman: Maybe first.

Ms. Candler: I think Process makes sense going first.

(sounds of assent)

Mr. Walters: So before Map or after Map?

(several conflicting responses)

Mr. Walters: What? Which?

Chair Axthelm: I heard a “before” and heard an “after.” So who wants them before – raise of hands. Process before? Three before. After?

Ms. Del Vecchio: Sorry, yeah. I think it makes sense for after the Map Amendments.

Ms. Lohman: Well, there’s kind of a break in a way. Because the citizen ones, they paid their money. I would like to make sure we heard them.

Chair Axthelm: I think it’s more because if he was here tonight.

Ms. Lohman: Well, and he’s – that’s – he’s in that.

Chair Axthelm: Oh, I see. You were asking for that one to be first.

Ms. Lohman: Yeah.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, the Map Amendments first. So does everybody want the Map Amend – I got three without Map Amendments – sorry. Three people –

Mr. Walters: I'll try to ask questions with only one possible answer.

Chair Axthelm: Three people wanted the Process first and the rest of you want the Map Amendments first. All right, so Map Amendments by a nod.

Ms. Candler: So Process goes after Map Amendments, according to the vote.

Chair Axthelm: Yes.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Could I also request that the citizen advisory committee actually be taken out of Process? Because it's not as much Process for *this*. It's more of a substantive thing, even though it's procedural. We can expand on that when we get to it, but just trust me. Can we move it out of Process for now?

Mr. Walters: To?

Ms. Del Vecchio: To CPPs and Comp Plan.

Ms. Mitchell: It's okay with me.

Chair Axthelm: You good there?

Ms. Lohman: Mm-hmm.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. So let's go ahead and start with the Sedro-Woolley UGA. If you like, just go up to the microphone and start out from the get-go.

Mr. Walters: We were hoping that you would not invite new testimony, but instead ask questions.

Chair Axthelm: The reason here was more of a clarification. There were some people that had some questions.

Mr. Walters: Yeah.

Chair Axthelm: Or didn't quite understand what he had talked about before. So I think Kathy – was that Kathy who made the comment?

John Coleman: Now staff had – is this on?

Chair Axthelm: Hold on a second. Because of process, we probably should ask the questions. Let's see – Martha. I think you had – you're the one _____.

Ms. Rose: Okay, I'm happy to ask a question.

Chair Axthelm: Yeah.

Ms. Rose: So I'm looking at this map and I think the brown area is the area that you said was a lot of critical areas – some wetlands and other things. In the proposed zoning, there is one house per acre, and there's about 10 acres? Is that – do I have those numbers sort of right?

Mr. Coleman: So the brown area is 42.8 acres proposed at one-acre zoning.

Ms. Rose: So it's 42 acres.

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Ms. Rose: Okay.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah.

Ms. Rose: And then the yellow areas that have the horizontal lines, how many acres total in that area?

Mr. Coleman: I tried to call it out on the map. There's one area, it's 106.5 that is zoned R-1 – or, I'm sorry; that should be R-5. Yeah. And then 42.8, that's zoned R-1. And then 6.5 – that would be zoned Mixed Commercial.

Ms. Rose: I see. So –

Mr. Coleman: Those call-out boxes around give the details.

Ms. Rose: So there's – is it a total of 106.5 acres is the hatched area? Is that – because it's stated twice, so does that mean it's two times 106.5 or is it just once?

Mr. Coleman: For clarification, let me answer that exactly. The area on the map is about 155.8 acres. That is 106.5 acres of R-5 zoning, 42.8 acres of R-1 zoning, and 6.5 acres of Mixed Commercial zoning. And that is what the County staff is referring to a “northern UGA expansion request.”

Ms. Rose: So I only have one question that's – I understand about running the sewer and how the sewer is all gravity feed so it's a doable thing to this neighborhood. I'm stuck on this question of why develop the brown area at all and why not just increase the density of the yellow areas around it, and save the brown area for open space since it's – because one house per acre –

Mr. Coleman: Well, there's residences in the brown area already.

Ms. Rose: Oh, there already are.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah. I mean, if it was vacant land then, you know, there might be other options. I did include it on a second map for clarification which parcels are vacant, which ones have a structure but not a home, and which ones have a home. “H” for home or house; “S” for structure; “V” for vacant. And then at the top right of the screen, it gives a description of how that breaks

down. There's 88 acres and 15 lots that are either vacant or have a structure, so those would be considered developable – 88 acres – without too much effort. That leaves 61.3 acres on 23 lots where there – the properties are either completely or partially developed with single-family residences. So that brings the question, you know: Those are *partially* vacant. How much of those can be developed? So, you know, some areas couldn't be developed at all because they're smaller lots, but if we make an assumption that 25% would not be – you know, 25% of that land is encumbered by residences, which is a very low figure. That would be about 15 acres in that area that's developed, which would leave 61.3 acres out of – I'm sorry. That would leave 61.3 minus 15.3 acres of land that could be developed on those that have houses.

Ms. Rose: So is the plan to run the sewer to all the existing and future, including in the brown area?

Mr. Coleman: So sewer would be extended as there is need for it. The existing houses wouldn't – we wouldn't extend the sewer – well, first of all they need to annex. Before that it would need to be in the urban growth area, and then the property owners would want to annex. And then it's developer-driven, is how sewer is usually provided to an area, unless there's a lot of houses or there's some impetus for the City to find a funding source to extend the sewer up northward. Typically it would be developer-driven. So, for example, should the large lot on the east side of State Route 20 – the one with an "H"; that's fairly vacant there – should they develop, they would bring sewer all the way up to the northern extent of it, thereby allowing all the property owners on the west side of the highway to connect to sewer.

Ms. Rose: I don't think I have any more questions.

Ms. Candler: Did you mean to say "9," or you meant "20"?

Mr. Coleman: I meant to say "9." Thank you for correcting me.

Chair Axthelm: Sorry, Kathy – you didn't have any more? Not Kathy. I'm sorry.

Ms. Rose: I don't have any more questions.

Ms. Lohman: Martha.

Chair Axthelm: Martha.

Mr. Raschko: I do have a question.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, hold on a second. ____?

Ms. Candler: I'm okay with Tim going first.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Go ahead, Tim.

Mr. Raschko: I know we talked about this once before, but just for the record tell me why we would have R-5 zoning, particularly when almost half of the acreage is not going to be developed. And with the cost of the infrastructure – for sewers and that – you know, a higher density would dilute the cost of bringing those services in. And secondly, with the need to have developable lots within the UGAs, it seems that going for R-5 zoning would make it more

difficult, you know, to supply those lots in the future and hasten the time when you have to expand your UGA once again and just continue the sprawl.

Mr. Coleman: Well, this should get us out to 2036 so hopefully the hastening would be quite some time down the road. But to answer your – a couple of points on the chosen zoning: R-5 – our options are going to be R-5 or R-7, which would be 6,000-square-foot lots under R-7. The R-5 zone allows for planned residential developments, which can get you down to smaller lots closer – minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet, and then that would allow higher densities while actually putting aside additional open space as part of the development, which we see as a desirable outcome and an efficient use of land. So the R-5 is flexible and it allows for property owners to develop down to just about very similar zoning densities as our R-7 zone.

Mr. Raschko: Now I would make the same comment about the R-1. Am I right in that that's one per acre?

Mr. Coleman: Right. And admittedly, that's very low density. I'm not trying to hide anything on that. But the fact of the matter is that area's a uniquely environmentally constrained area and that's why we have proposed for the lower density: to minimize the impact on the lake, the streams, and the wetlands that are all throughout that area.

Mr. Raschko: Well, thank you.

Chair Axthelm: Amy, did you have anything?

Ms. Hughes: I'd like to ask a question about the eastern area that you want to take out of the UGA. So could you point that out to me exactly so everybody knows where we're talking?

Mr. Coleman: Yeah. Just above the pencil there is what we refer to as our eastern UGA, and that's the area that we have problems having development in because of the lack of services and the lack of a lot of developable land that would allow a large development to go in that would be the driver of bringing sewer and other public services to that area. So that area itself is in the hatched area that's yellow is somewhere in the area of 200 acres. I don't have the number specifically right in front of me. We did an analysis to determine that. We looked at every property in that lot, every property in that area, and determined that between the vacant and the semi-vacant parcels there's 35 acres of developable land.

Since that analysis, the City bought 10 acres of that land – of the most developable land – adjacent to the cemetery for public use, so making even less of that area available for development. But that's the area. In the most recent County staff report, County staff did an analysis of that 35 acres and how much should be able to be transferred northward, and what they determined was – or what they're recommending is that not all 35 acres be put up there – be allowed to expand; however, allow the 10 acres and another 5.9 acres, so what they're recommending is 130-acre expansion versus our requested 149-acre residential. We're not talking about the commercial, so excuse the numbers. You add the 6.5 and you get to the 155.

So what I did is – to address their concern, I wanted to point out that in the urban growth area expansion area, as we've proposed it, there's a power line with a 100-foot easement that slashes across it creating a 100-foot swath that is not developable, At roughly 2300 linear feet long, that equates to 5.3 acres of land in that area that can't be developed, as well as the _____. In previous analysis, we hadn't discussed how much was partially vacant and how much was totally vacant – that's why this figure is up there in front of you – and we found that 15.3 acres in

that area is already developed. Put that together with 5.3 acres of power line and we're at 20 acres of already developed land in this urban growth area expansion area, which is just about exactly the amount that they've requested that we reduce our urban growth area expansion by. So we feel in this new analysis – or this refined analysis – there's no need for the County to reduce our requested urban growth area expansion as staff has recommended in their latest report.

Ms. Hughes: Okay, so specifically the question with the eastern area: Is there any potential for redevelopment in that area?

Mr. Coleman: That's been calculated into it. That 35 acres is land that can be – vacant land that can be further developed. As far as redevelopment, I believe what you mean is if someone were to remove a property or remove a structure and redevelop it –

Ms. Hughes: Yeah. Upgrade an area to bring it into a UGA-type setting.

Mr. Coleman: If somebody wanted – say someone had like a two-acre parcel and they wanted to knock their house down and put in 10 units, they could do that except there's no sewer available to them, which means they would have to build a sewer pump station. That's the minimum that would meet – our sewer service goes as far east as it possibly can without requiring an additional sewer pump, so it'd require a pump station and then the sewer infrastructure to be developed in the streets out there – meaning rebuilding the streets – then redeveloping the streets to urban standards for 10 units. So there is some redevelopment potential. It doesn't pencil out for any developer, though.

Ms. Hughes: And at this point, the City doesn't want to move residential services that direction?

Mr. Coleman: It's not in the city.

Ms. Hughes: It's in a UGA area.

Mr. Coleman: Which means they would have to want to annex in order to have access to city sewer, and so far there's no impetus for people in that eastern UGA to do so because they already have all of the services they need. You know, they're on septic; they're either on well or mostly on PUD water. So there's no reason for them to want to have access to urban services, which is really the crux of the issue of why that eastern UGA can't accommodate further urban growth – is because nobody out there is going to annex and develop their property because it doesn't pencil out for them.

Ms. Hughes: Okay.

Chair Axthelm: Kathi?

Ms. Jett: No questions.

Chair Axthelm: Annie?

Ms. Lohman: My question is on that western edge by Brickyard Creek.

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Ms. Lohman: Can you explain that a little bit? What – it just says “for public purposes.”

Mr. Coleman: Okay, so this is 5 acres that the City purchased adjacent to Janicki Fields. It is just outside of city limits and the City originally purchased it for a potential road connection through to – from Cook Road to Highway 20, which, as a lot of people – or at least local residents to Sedro-Woolley – know is a much-needed connection. That was – that could happen in the future but it right now is just City-owned property that is likely to remain City-owned property for the potential of moving a road or possibly just, you know, make a field out of it in the meantime. But there’s no specific plans for it right now. It was originally purchased as a potential right-of-way, which is the way Sedro-Woolley likes to acquire right-of-way. We don’t like to take land from people as part of developments, or just take land from people. We prefer to purchase land with foresight to providing services to those citizens in the future.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Kathy?

Ms. Mitchell: My question’s already been answered. Thank you.

Chair Axthelm: Tammy?

Ms. Candler: Thank you. Can you zoom out a little bit and show us where the sewer goes to right now up in the northern direction up there?

Mr. Coleman: In the northern direction?

Ms. Candler: Yeah.

Mr. Coleman: I can show you exactly. It goes right to city limits. It goes up Highway 9 and ends right at city limits. That green parcel just to the left of my pen is Fire Station 2. When we constructed that, we brought the sewer up to that point.

Ms. Candler: Thank you. I think you answered that once before. Thank you. I remember now. On the bigger map, the broader map that you have, I have a question about the density difference between what is the – the yellow areas both east and west of Highway 9, just south of the proposed UGA expansion to the north, what is the difference in the densities there from what you’re proposing in the new area? Those are not R-5s, I’m assuming.

Mr. Coleman: On the map on the screen, the brighter yellow is R-5.

Ms. Candler: Oh, it *is* R-5. Okay.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah. The more mustardy yellow is the R-7. You can see that’s closer to the core of town.

Ms. Candler: Okay. So the mustard yellow on the east side, also R-7?

Mr. Coleman: Correct.

Ms. Candler: And there’s some R-7, well, both east and west.

Mr. Coleman: Correct.

Ms. Candler: Okay. I don't have any other questions right now.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Hollie?

Ms. Del Vecchio: So the proposed expansion to the north, if we were at maximum capacity/maximum build-out, how many residences are we talking about there?

Mr. Coleman: Well, the 42.8 acres around Bottomless Lake in the R-1 zone, that would be 42.8 acre –

Ms. Del Vecchio: I can do that math. Do the rest of it for me!

Mr. Coleman: That would be 42.8 units. I believe the County staff report – the latest staff report – actually includes that analysis. On page – exhibit 1 – under 14 acres of – so the 14 acres would be, according to this analysis, 50 units. And then to make up for the 21 acres of Mixed Commercial, that would be 105 units – 150 units. Excuse me. And then the 35 acres of R-5 that would be transferred from the eastern urban growth area would be 175 units. So roughly speaking, in the 100-and –

Ms. Del Vecchio: That doesn't make – I'm sorry. I'm not following that at all because to me –

Mr. Coleman: In the 149 acres expansion to the north would be 375 units.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Okay, where are you getting the 375?

Mr. Coleman: Table – exhibit 1 on – of Appendix 1, where it says "Units" – the second-to-the last column.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Okay, so to me – I guess maybe I'm misreading this, but to me that's – the 150.5 is the number of units that we're losing as a result of converting the pink area to Mixed Commercial. To me that's not an addition.

Mr. Coleman: That's just – those are additional units, yeah. Because when we –

Ms. Del Vecchio: There's a negative next to it. I need you –

Mr. Coleman: Maybe staff can explain why there's a negative better than I can because they put this together.

Ms. Del Vecchio: I mean, to me this looks like a loss of 150 units because we're moving to Mixed Commercial, and then because of the movement away from the eastern area we're losing 175 units there. Is that not what this is saying?

Dale Pernula: 175 units for how many acres is that Commercial?

Ms. Del Vecchio: No, no, no. The Mixed Commercial – so it says R-7 converted to Mixed Commercial, and then "units" it says negative 150.5.

Ms. Lohman: All of the numbers in those last three columns are negatives.

Ms. Rose: I think it's a mistake. It's supposed to be a positive.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Well, but I don't understand why we'd be gaining residential units by converting something to Mixed Commercial.

Mr. Walters: I think that's why it's a negative.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Exactly. No, the negative makes sense to *me*.

Mr. Coleman: So on this, the R-5 – when it was R-7, 21.5 acres of R-7 would have provided 150 units, based on this analysis. So we rezoned – or are going to rezone 21 acres within the city limits from R-7 to Mixed Commercial, which means we lose the capacity for 150 units. So we take that 150 units, apply it to the northern area and expand the urban growth area to the north to accommodate 150 units.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Okay, so you're saying – so I am reading this correctly, though. Because you were just – so the negative 150.5, what you're saying is that because we're losing it here you are adding it to the surrounding areas. But I don't see a number for how many residences we can expect from this northern expansion.

Mr. Coleman: Okay, well, that's the 375 number. So we've got 150 lost from the rezone that we apply to the expansion area. There's 35 acres in the eastern UGA that could accommodate 175 units, so we're asking to transfer those 175 units in the expansion area. And then our Buildable Lands Analysis showed that we were short 10 acres, or 50 units, just altogether before we did a rezone, before we looked at the other 35 acres. So that's where the 375 units comes from.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Okay, so we're expecting 375 units with the expansion because we're losing in other areas so you have to build out. Okay.

Mr. Coleman: Correct.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Thank you. Do we – what kind of commercial is going to be supported by 375 units of residential? Do we know that?

Mr. Coleman: Well, we've requested 6.5 acres of zoning at the corner of Bassett Road just south of Bassett.

Ms. Del Vecchio: I don't mean it in terms of acreage. I mean what kind – have we done any kind of analysis of what kind of a business can actually be supported by that – because that's going to be their market area right there, so those – can that number of units support a Mixed Commercial –

Mr. Pernula: I think I can partly answer that. That's adjacent to some existing city development as well, so the market is way beyond what's in this area that's being added to the – added to.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Okay.

Mr. Pernula: If you look at the map there's a lot of existing development to the south.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Right.

Ms. Candler: To the south – but we're up north, aren't we?

Mr. Pernula: Yeah, but, see, it's – this isn't in the center of the new area being annexed and developed.

Ms. Candler: Oh, I see.

Mr. Pernula: This is adjacent to the existing city, so I think it's fair to say that the market for that commercial development is more than just what's anticipated to be developed in the new area.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Okay, but the folks in the south have pretty good access to pretty large commercial.

Mr. Pernula: True.

Ms. Del Vecchio: You've got a lot of stuff down there. So that would have to be some really attractive Mixed Commercial uses to draw those up that direction rather than – because if you're running errands, you're going to the store, I imagine you're most likely to head into town unless traffic is so unbearable that you're going to be staying close by, or you've got some really attractive, small, you know, local businesses that – I'm just – I'll tell you where my question died. I'll try and get to a question here. How do we know that the residents in this new expansion are actually going to be utilizing that commercial zoning? Because I imagine that's the intent, right? To take some of the traffic – the pressure off of Highway 9. So has there been any kind of an analysis done to tell us that that's actually going to happen?

Mr. Coleman: Well, our Buildable Lands Analysis showed and the census and the Countywide Policies gave the City a certain amount of expected urban growth for employment as well as residential. So we're accommodating the potential growth in the northern area. Highway 9 serves all the way up to – the next commercial facility up Highway 9 would be _____. So there's a large market going up 9 for small-scale retail. Just to the east of that property is a large vacant property that we've been anticipating a large – 250 units – residential development that would connect to an existing 250-unit residential development that now has to go all the way down Fruitdale Road. So we're anticipating many – I don't know the number of vehicle trips in particular but it'd be somewhere in the neighborhood of 500 residential homes just to the east of there that would have access to that. So, yeah, there is expected residential growth in the area that would benefit from a small-scale retail, whether it's a gas station or a small grocery store or whatever the services in the area dictate and, you know, obviously the free market has to take over there. We can't dictate exactly what's going to go on a property.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Understood, but have you had – has anybody expressed interest in actually –

Mr. Coleman: The property owner has said that he would be interested in having that as Mixed Commercial, yes.

Ms. Del Vecchio: But the businesses – have any businesses expressed an interest in actually building in that new commercial zone?

Mr. Coleman: Well, that would be putting the cart many, many years ahead of the horse.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Is that ____? Okay. I'm just trying to get an understanding of how – whether there's people that have already expressed an interest.

Mr. Coleman: The property owner's expressed an interest in –

Ms. Del Vecchio: – in developing it. Okay.

Mr. Coleman: – in having the property zoned Mixed Commercial.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Sure. Okay, that's all my questions.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Any other questions?

(silence)

Chair Axthelm: Okay, so we'll – thank you for the information.

Ms. Rose: Thank you.

Chair Axthelm: We'll just – we'll leave that item for next time and finish deliberations next meeting for that question. So the next map amendment that's in my list – Burlington UGA. _____ with Martha.

Ms. Rose: So we're talking about the Burlington one?

Chair Axthelm: Yep. It's the Burlington UGA. Well, actually the person that had asked the question or mentioned it was Kathy Mitchell. We want to give her a chance to talk about hers.

Ms. Mitchell: What was the question?

Chair Axthelm: Was the Burlington UGA. You're the one that mentioned it, or at least it says "KM" on it.

Ms. Mitchell: Yeah. Right, I was just hoping that we could put it right to the top of the list and get discussion going, so I'd like to make a motion that we approve the Burlington UGA.

Ms. Candler: I'll second the motion.

Ms. Rose: I can't hear.

Chair Axthelm: Oh, okay. We need to speak a little more into the microphone.

Ms. Mitchell: What I said was I'd like to get the discussion really going. I'd like to make a motion that we approve the Burlington UGA.

Ms. Candler: And I seconded the motion.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, it's been moved and seconded to approve the Burlington UGA as shown on the proposal.

Mr. Johnson: We did have a request for the person who transcribes these meetings for all of you to be sure to be speaking into the microphones throughout the duration of your comments, because sometimes voices trail off later. So just – I thought I would mention that.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. I think the problem's coming with me because when I turn my head it doesn't go into the microphone so it's hard – I'll kick this over a little bit. Okay. So it's been moved and seconded to approve the Burlington UGA's expansion as shown in the proposal. Dale?

Mr. Pernula: We had three parcels that the City of Burlington did not want to have included in the UGA expansion – the three parcels that were not requested by the property owners – and staff recommended that they not be included, even though they were included in the proposal. That was the Walkup, Sager, and Rohweder parcels, and we would recommend that they be removed.

Mr. Johnson: Just for – I've actually spoken with Sager and I believe she would like to be in the urban growth area but she hasn't availed herself – as far as I know – of the public comment opportunity before the Burlington City Council or before the Planning Commission here. So take that for what it's worth.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Do we know about Walkup? So this comment came from Rohweder? You know, we have three different property owners referenced in the comments.

Ms. Candler: Is that because of location, or are they in between or something?

Mr. Johnson: Well, to be clear, the City has asked that – it's interesting. In their comment, they said, Please remove Sager and Rohweder. They didn't say remove Walkup. And then Rohweder asked to be removed. We haven't heard from Sager officially and we don't have comment from Sedro-Woolley on Walkup or from the property owner on that one.

Several Commissioners: Sedro-Woolley?

Mr. Johnson: Burlington – sorry.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, but City of Burlington did request that Sager and Rohweder be removed.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah.

Ms. Del Vecchio: But not Walkup.

Mr. Johnson: I don't think so.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Where is Walkup coming from then?

Mr. Walters: What do you mean?

Ms. Del Vecchio: I mean why is it listed here?

Mr. Walters: When we proposed this for docketing, we tried to draw a boundary that made sense based on existing parcel ownership and didn't create that little island of Sager and Rohweder. But Burlington – well, actually we talked to Burlington at the time and they thought that was fine, but Burlington changed their minds. So Burlington doesn't want Sager and Rohweder. They have remained silent on Walkup. You could put in your motion that approve it consistent with however Burlington wants it, or approve the expansion to include just the Housing Authority-owned parcels.

Ms. Lohman: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

Chair Axthelm: Yes, Annie?

Ms. Lohman: Ryan, on the map it appears that you split Walkup's property. Is that the situation there?

Mr. Walters: It was already split. The blue border and the blue shading is the existing UGA. So the existing UGA line runs through the Walkup property, and we're not aware of why it does except that it makes a nice straight line out further north, so assumedly that's the reason. That line would jog if we did include the rest of the Walkup property.

Ms. Candler: I have a question.

Chair Axthelm: Tammy?

Ms. Candler: Thank you. I know the whole point of this is to get Tesoro out there. And what – is that definitely happening if we do this? Like, is funding in place that it's definitely happening?

Mr. Walters: Yes. There's a \$625,000 appropriation from the legislature. We have an interlocal agreement that is all but signed. The Housing Authority is ready to go. Burlington is okay. The County Commissioners are kicking in money for road improvements. It's quite the deal.

Ms. Candler: Okay. Go ahead.

Ms. Del Vecchio: I guess my concern with just removing Walkup would be if Walkup was included in the original proposal and, as far as we know, maybe they want to be included, then I'm a little nervous about just removing them and not – you know, without hearing from them that that's what they desire.

Mr. Walters: Well, in any case we wouldn't be removing their entire parcel. We'd just be rolling back to where the blue line is now. So half of their parcel would be in the UGA and half not. Ultimately, however, Burlington and the County need to agree.

Ms. Del Vecchio: So I guess – yeah – so if the County is – or if Burlington is just asking for Sager and Rohweder to be removed, then I guess that would be – my thought is to stick to those two rather than dragging Walkup into it.

Chair Axthelm: Kathy?

Mr. Johnson: If I could – we're scanning through the comments right now trying to find the Burlington comment to make sure that they didn't also mention Walkup.

Several Commissioners: Thank you.

Ms. Mitchell: My thoughts are going that way as well. There's a couple things I'd like to throw out to you guys. You were privy to meetings that we were not, naturally. Was the County able to address all of the City of Burlington's concerns except for this little bit that you were talking about now?

Mr. Pernula: I would have to go through the entire memorandum. They – we attended a meeting of the Burlington City Council. They listed a lot of issues they wanted to have addressed, and I think we addressed those pretty much adequately. It included recreational facilities, road improvements, some sidewalk improvements on Gardner Road which we – it's in the city; we couldn't do those. But it was quite a list and I think we satisfied that to their satisfaction, and that's why they went ahead with approval of a resolution approving.

Ms. Mitchell: Okay. And just to keep along the same line of thought, one of the things that still concerns me a lot is the fact that it is in the 100-year floodplain. And I do understand that there are ways of mitigating that and I'm assuming that it's already been played out and that kind of thing – to maybe raise it up higher. Is that correct?

Mr. Pernula: The latest proposal that we've seen is that they plan on filling right at the footprint of the new – the 14 proposed dwelling units. Phase II they actually put garages below it and elevated the structures above the base flood elevation.

Ms. Mitchell: They are quite a bit higher.

Chair Axthelm: Martha?

Ms. Rose: What percentage of this parcel – or these parcels are developed? In other words, are they fully developed or are they 50%, or somewhere in between?

Mr. Pernula: I'd have to pull out the maps, but there have been two phases already completed. One is on the south end. I believe it had 51 units – Phase I. Second phase had, like, 30 units. This third phase would have 14 units, and the fourth phase would have a number of units so the entire development would have a total of 125. So it's largely developed now.

Ms. Rose: Right. So these two people that didn't want to be included, are they – are those two – our map went away, but whatever their names were – the ones in the lower left. So are they just like a single-family house on a – on more land, or what's – to put it in perspective, it looks like each parcel might be an acre or two. Do we know?

Mr. Johnson: I could look in the staff report. Again, Sager has indicated to me, but not to you, that they would like to be included, and Rohweder has indicated in public comment that they would not like to be included, and Sedro-Woolley has said, We don't want either of them in.

Several Commissioners: Burlington.

Mr. Johnson: I don't know why I keep doing that.

Ms. Rose: Oh, I see. So Burlington doesn't want them in there.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah.

Ms. Rose: But they're going to be running sewer there anyway and it's clearly adjacent to other development. So I was just wondering what the story behind it was. It makes sense to me to include Sager, but not if – it's whatever they want, I guess.

Ms. Del Vecchio: I guess. And I'll correct myself earlier. I thought you had told us before that Sager did *not* want to be in it so I just missed – I jumbled that in my head. Is it a cost for the reason –

Ms. Lohman: Hollie, point of order here. In your staff report on the public comments on page 21 it says owner Rohweder does not want their property in there, but it's silent on Sager.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Right. Kirk was adding additional information earlier –

Ms. Lohman: But how can we consider information that we don't have? I mean –

Mr. Johnson: I just wanted to correct an assertion that was made that Sager did *not* want to be in, and I have had direct communication as recently as a week ago that Sager *did* want to be in but I clearly noted that Sager did not comment to you, so that's not official, and they didn't avail themselves of their opportunity to comment. So I just wanted to correct the assertion that Sager does not want in. I have reason to believe they do, but they didn't comment so they're –

Ms. Lohman: I don't think the Planning Commission can consider either way on that one, whether the owner wants in or out, because we don't know.

Mr. Walters: I guess more importantly in that discussion though, Burlington doesn't, and under our agreements we *have* to agree.

Ms. Del Vecchio: So to me, I guess, the reason I was asking the questions is just to get a better understanding of the situation, and maybe we don't enough information to be deciding on whether especially Sager should be included or excluded. But I had misunderstood. I thought that what you had said was that, well, you heard from Sager – which, granted, we're just asking questions right now – was consistent with what Burlington was saying. And it sounds like maybe that's not consistent and so it's something that we need to look into further before we decide on that.

Chair Axthelm: I wanted to make sure I was paying attention down here. Is there any comments from this direction? Okay, Tammy?

Ms. Candler: If I'm understanding you right, Ryan, you're saying that if we don't agree with what Burlington is saying, this will not happen. Then I think we have enough information. That's my opinion!

Chair Axthelm: So my question is, What would – what went to the hearing? The hearing included Sager and –

Mr. Johnson: All three.

Chair Axthelm: All three. Okay.

Ms. Mitchell: So realistically we should amend it to take the two out besides Walkup, correct?

Chair Axthelm: So this information is coming after the hearing or during the public comment process?

Mr. Johnson: You got a comment from Sedro-Woolley that said –

Chair Axthelm: Or Burlington, yes. It's okay – I understand!

Ms. Mitchell: You need a dinner!

(laughter)

Mr. Johnson: Please take Sager and Rohweder out. They may make sense down the road but we haven't included them in our capacity analysis, we're not sure it's compliant with the Growth Management Act, and we don't want to go down a path where we might get appealed, so please take them out.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Mr. Johnson: And you heard from Rohweder saying, I don't want to be in. And you didn't hear from Sager.

Chair Axthelm: But this was during the public comment process.

Mr. Johnson: Yes. Yeah.

Ms. Candler: And do we know what Burlington's – we don't know what Burlington's saying about Walkup.

Mr. Johnson: They didn't say anything.

Mr. Walters: Yeah, I recommend you just be silent on Walkup. I don't – I think we have a comment letter from Burlington, but I don't know that we have approval from Burlington through their Comp Plan process of the whole thing. When we do get that – and we'll place a call and see where we are – the Board of County Commissioners might have to make that final tweak on Walkup. But they will anyway. So I would recommend you just address those two or just put in your recommendation all the Housing Authority property.

Chair Axthelm: So here's my concern, is that because it went through public hearing as all of them in, and now you're taking out those three, that affects other properties that are adjacent and they have no opportunity to comment.

Ms. Lohman: But one owner did.

Chair Axthelm: One owner did comment.

Ms. Lohman: Yes.

Chair Axthelm: But the proposal was always *all* of the properties and now some of them come out, so the comments that were made were based on that those properties were proposed to be in. So it's just kind of an odd circumstance, because really the comments that people made or could have made, now there's no opportunity for those people to say, Hold it. We didn't even know if those properties were in or out. You were proposing they were in. We were okay with that. Now you're proposing to take them back out but they have no opportunity to comment.

Mr. Walters: Yes, but that's always the case where we're rolling back to the status quo. So when we propose a change, if we don't make the change we don't have to take comment on not making the change that we originally proposed. Rolling back to the status quo is okay.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, but what I'm saying is you're still making a change. You're still making the change, you're just – you're changing it, and that's the concern I have. If you took out the change entirely – the whole Housing Authority area – I could understand that. But what you've done is added the Housing Authority and then now you're going to take out the other two areas, and to me that looks like a puzzle piece cut out. I mean, really, it's –

Mr. Walters: Well, that's why we proposed it initially, but those two properties are currently not in the UGA and after this action they would still not be in the UGA. So there would be no change from the status quo for those two properties. So, yes, it is a different – a slightly different proposal as a result, but it is rolling back to the status quo for those parcels. That's pretty much always how we operate. Something gets proposed. If a piece of it doesn't pass muster, we just don't do that piece. We don't have to take additional public comment on rolling it back to how it was and leaving it alone.

Ms. Candler: And I think that's true for every – any kind of a comment we would make, or a recommendation we would make on anything is something that could potentially need to be commented on.

Chair Axthelm: Yeah. Just for information, where's the access for Rohweder and Sager and Walkup?

Mr. Walters: Well, Walkup –

Chair Axthelm: Do you have an aerial view?

Mr. Walters: – here is on Lafayette Road. Lafayette Road is right here. And then down here we have Sanchez Lane. I don't know how Sager is accessed, but Sanchez Lane is the access to Raspberry Ridge I.

Chair Axthelm: Do you have an aerial?

Mr. Walters: This is a new feature. Yeah, so these two yellow highlighted items here are the ones we're talking about. I don't know how access is acquired there.

Chair Axthelm: The reason I say is that you get properties that are – you have to go – or they're outside the city limits, but you drive inside the city limits. It's kind of an odd situation where it's kind of cut puzzle-pieced out from the back side. So if the access comes from Sanchez Lane and everybody else on Sanchez Lane is within the city, then –

Mr. Walters: Well, they're within the UGA.

Chair Axthelm: Or U – well, yeah, UGA, but still.

Mr. Walters: I mean, even within the UGA right now you have that weird island to the west there encircled. There are frequently smaller issues like that.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ms. Mitchell: So do you guys want an amendment then to –

Chair Axthelm: Or just restate – do you want to restate the proposal? Because we never did vote on it anyway.

Ms. Lohman: Well, we're at the discussion stage.

Ms. Candler: I think we need an amendment.

Ms. Del Vecchio: So I would move to amend the current motion to include – or to remove – you've got to give me the names again, Ryan! – to remove Sager and – no, just to remove Sager and Rohweder properties from the Burlington UGA expansion, on the basis that Burlington did not include those properties in their analysis.

Ms. Candler: I'll second the amendment.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, and the original maker of the motion, is that fine?

Ms. Mitchell: That's fine with me.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. So it's been moved and seconded to amend the motion to state: Approve the Burlington UGA expansion without Rohweder and the Sager parcels that Burlington did not approve. Is there one close to that?

Ms. Rose: I think one of the staff proposed that we just say that we approve whatever Burlington wants in that group, which would give them flexibility to change their mind.

Ms. Candler: I think the recommendation was we remain silent on Walkup.

Ms. Rose: I don't know if there's any point in that.

Mr. Walters: Yeah, the Board can address it later, once we actually hear from Burlington.

Ms. Lohman: You could just say to approve just the Housing Authority property.

Chair Axthelm: So these are our recommendations. They can always change them.

Mr. Walters: Right.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Any further discussion?

Mr. Walters: But you have those several options.

Chair Axthelm: Annie? Further discussion here?

(silence)

Chair Axthelm: Okay, so all those in favor of the statement as shown on the screen, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Axthelm: All those opposed, say “nay.”

(silence)

Chair Axthelm: Okay, the ayes have it. Okay, and the next – since I don’t have that updated list, I don’t know which one’s next.

Mr. Walters: Edison.

Chair Axthelm: Edison, which is on page 23. So we have a motion for –

Ms. Mitchell: I move that we accept Concrete Concepts as proposed.

Ms. Lohman: Second.

Chair Axthelm: Is it Concrete?

Ms. Lohman: If you turn to page 18 of the original staff report that we saw on March 8th –

Chair Axthelm: Well, are we on Concrete Concepts or Edison?

Ms. Lohman: Yes, it’s in Edison.

Chair Axthelm: All right. Sorry. So Concrete Concepts, page 18.

Ms. Lohman: Page 18 of the March 8th staff report.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ms. Lohman: And the public comments is on –

Chair Axthelm: Hold it. We had a motion and a second – correct? – to approve.

Several Commissioners: Yes.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, so it’s been – we had a motion and a second to approve the Concrete Concepts map amendment. Discussion on that? Let’s start down with Hollie.

Ms. Del Vecchio: I don’t have any issues with it. _____.

Ms. Candler: I would be supportive of it.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ms. Mitchell: I’m supportive of it.

Ms. Lohman: I think it makes perfect sense. It’s already in a Rural Village and I think it’s great.

Chair Axthelm: Any other comments? Kathi?

Ms. Jett: No.

Mr. Raschko: No.

Ms. Hughes: No comment.

Ms. Rose: No comments.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. So are we done with the comments? Okay, good, so all those in favor of the motion – approve the Concrete Concepts map amendment, as shown on the screen – say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Axthelm: All those opposed, say “nay.”

(silence)

Chair Axthelm: Ayes have it. Unanimous.

Ms. Candler: I move that we approve the Edison Granary.

Chair Axthelm: It's page 23.

Ms. Mitchell: Second.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, so it's been moved and seconded to approve the Edison Granary recommendations as shown on page 23 of the staff report. Do we have comments on – let's start down with –

Ms. Rose: My only comment is that it makes sense.

Chair Axthelm: Martha.

Ms. Rose: That's it.

Ms. Hughes: No further comment.

Chair Axthelm: Tim?

Mr. Raschko: No comment.

Chair Axthelm: Kathi?

Ms. Jett: No comment.

Ms. Lohman: No comment.

Ms. Mitchell: Question: Just because I know that quite a few of the people in Edison are concerned about the sewer thing – somebody raised a question about that. Could you give us a brief rundown, please, Dale, on why it's okay?

Mr. Pernula: Kirk, you looked into that, didn't you?

Mr. Johnson: Yeah. Commissioner Mitchell asked a question and I checked with our Edison expert and then replied an email to all of you, and I since confirmed it with her. She was back in the office. So Edison Granary, they have – they've done the soils test. They have adequate land and the appropriate soils to be able to do an onsite septic system. I did just read in the staff report that they also have a community hookup, so I don't know but it kind of sounds like they plan to use the onsite system and maybe the community hookup as well. But if they opt to go only with the onsite system, if that meets the, you know, the septage that they generate, there's really no way policies, regulations, tools that the County has, to force them to be on the community septic system, as the one commenter requested. And water is available within Edison through the water district, or water association.

Ms. Mitchell: Okay, so just to rephrase to be clear then: The sewer situation and the water situation are satisfactory to the County's expectations.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah, for both of these uses. If one of them wanted to be a bar or restaurant, that might not be the case. But for commercial uses – now the Concrete Concepts, if they're putting stuff into the system that the system can't handle, they may have to do some pre-treatment or have certain materials hauled away from the site rather than putting into the septic system. But there's no deal killer from the septic perspective for either of those.

Ms. Mitchell: Thank you very much for checking on that.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, comments?

Ms. Candler: I have nothing.

Chair Axthelm: Hollie?

Ms. Del Vecchio: No.

Chair Axthelm: No. I don't have any either. Okay. So we're good. So it's been moved and seconded to approve the Edison Granary map amendment as shown on the – anyway, as shown. All those in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

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

(silence)

Chair Axthelm: Okay. What's our next item on the list? Okay, and we answered the sewer for Edison.

Ms. Mitchell: Yes. Thank you very much.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, so Lake Erie Trucking.

Ms. Mitchell: I'd like to make a motion.

Chair Axthelm: And that's on page 14. Kathy?

Ms. Mitchell: I'd like to make a motion that we accept the Lake Erie Trucking as proposed.

Ms. Jett: Second.

Chair Axthelm: It's been moved and seconded to accept the Lake Erie Trucking as proposed. Discussion? Yeah – Martha?

Ms. Rose: I have a question, a question. So I think I heard the owner of the mine site say that the plan was to keep the area that's under – that's actually being mined a pretty constant number. Like – I don't remember how many acres it was but it was my understanding that they would be filling the area that was all mined out to extract rock from the area adjacent to it. So they would restore an area that's already mined as they excavate. So I don't know whether there are conditions or if that's part of the permit process. I think it is probably part of the permit process, and that's all I just want confirmation on because I think it's an okay proposal.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Mr. Raschko: Just a comment on your comment: I believe that it's regulated by Department of Natural Resources and you have to have a plan.

Ms. Rose: Right.

Mr. Raschko: You can only have so much area open at a single time and you have to have it reclaimed as you go.

Ms. Rose: That was my – okay. Thank you.

Chair Axthelm: Kathi?

Ms. Jett: My only comment is I live very close to that pit and I know over the years Mr. Wooding has maintained the property in such a fashion that other than – I mean, it's very difficult to know that there's even a pit there. There are lots of trees in the area and, you know, I never see gravel on the road from his trucks entering or leaving. So I definitely support it.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Annie?

Ms. Lohman: I don't have any comments.

Chair Axthelm: Kathy?

Ms. Mitchell: I've gone out there and looked several times at different times and have not seen problems either that somebody might as a passerby, so it looks like he's operating the way he says he is.

Chair Axthelm: Tammy?

Ms. Candler: I would be supportive of it. I don't have anything specific.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Hollie, any comments?

Ms. Del Vecchio: No comments.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, so it's been moved and seconded to approve the Lake Erie Trucking map amendment as proposed. All those in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Axthelm: All those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Axthelm: Ayes have it. Unanimous. Okay. Next item – this was no public work session on code or CPPs. And, Hollie, that was yours?

Mr. Walters: Before we proceed to those, do we expect to move the Sedro-Woolley map amendment to the recorded motion next week? Is that a reasonable expectation?

Chair Axthelm: Yes. Yes, we'll vote on that one – or finalize that one next week.

Mr. Walters: Okay.

Chair Axthelm: Because they asked for more discussion on it.

Mr. Walters: Right.

Ms. Mitchell: Is everybody comfortable with moving it to the top of the list next week?

(sounds of assent)

Ms. Lohman: Can I ask a Commissioner a question?

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ms. Lohman: Tammy, you were the one that wanted to delay.

Ms. Candler: Yeah, I think next week would be okay. Thank you. Thank you for asking. I'll try to be ready next week.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Are we all – I think we were all okay with that before. All right. Does that work, Ryan? All right. So now, Process. No public work session on code or CPPs. So who made that comment?

Mr. Johnson: That was in the public comment.

Ms. Del Vecchio: _____ the public comments, not one of us.

Chair Axthelm: That's right. Okay.

Mr. Walters: And that public comment is addressed with particularity in the staff report.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Page 24.

Chair Axthelm: 24? Thank you.

Ms. Lohman: Of the staff report? Tonight's staff report?

Chair Axthelm: Yes – staff report 1.

Ms. Mitchell: Can I interject a quick question for staff? When you put a staff report out for us next time, would you help us with numbers so where we can go speedily to comments, as in 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6?

Ms. Candler: You mean page numbers?

Ms. Mitchell: No, literally on the comments themselves so we can go "Page 5, number 2" – something like that.

Mr. Walters: Oh.

Ms. Lohman: Instead of the head.

Chair Axthelm: So as far as – does anybody have any issues with the response from the Planning Commission – or Planning Department? Or questions?

Ms. Del Vecchio: Well, I will just acknowledge that it has been a little while so – I mean, I don't know if we're looking at, you know, continuing anything out. It seems like that's something that – you know, having another public work session – it's been close to a year since that work session was held, so I can see why people would not remember that. I don't know if there's opportunity for revisiting that or any need for it, and maybe we can discuss that when we get to the code amendments.

Ms. Lohman: I think the challenge – Mr. Chair, if I can speak out of turn?

Chair Axthelm: Annie.

Ms. Lohman: I think the challenge is that we did see it, because I have in my notebook because I kept it together, the June meeting that staff referenced, but I had already had it by my own and I also had the January of 2016's meeting on my own. But we're in the loop. And I can understand because it being teased out that people might lose track, and then we bounce back to the Shoreline. But I really do think we did talk about the majority here at the Planning Commission.

Chair Axthelm: It might help in the future to have that so that we have even a quick work session so that it reviews on some information maybe. I don't know if that would help or not. I'm not talking now. I'm talking in the future. Okay. Kathy?

Ms. Mitchell: And something that might be helpful that you guys used to do – we've touched on it before but this would be extremely helpful. On that Planning Commission page where you put our agendas, transcripts, and videos, you guys used to put in the documents that were used for that session. If that were added back in there, that would help people a whole lot because

websites changed, things change. It's easy to lose track of where you were or what was done. So I understand the confusion. I understand the problem. If we could have that nicety back in there, it would help all of us.

Mr. Walters: I am rather unwilling to do that, frankly, because we don't maintain the website ourselves. Everything we add is an e-mail to the webmaster asking him "On this line, please add this bullet," and it is really a maintenance chore to make those things happen, especially when you're updating things constantly. We have tried to get it streamlined such that we can keep it as up-to-date as possible, and that has driven a lot of the different ways that you see the presentation of information – is how easy it is to maintain it.

Mr. Johnson: Ryan, could you enter the 2016 Update website? Because we listed all of the public meetings and work sessions right on that front page, so you could go to that to find the date and then you could go to the actual agenda.

Ms. Mitchell: That's true. I know what you're getting at, but it makes – for the people that know how it works, it makes – they're in the know and how to do it. The average person looking for something, it's so easy to get lost.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah.

Mr. Walters: Well, the other thing is that we orient these pages around the people that are interested in a *project* because we assume that people are more interested in the projects than people are more interested in the Planning Commission itself – that they are actually interested in the substance. That's why we try to orient all of this stuff around the project pages.

Ms. Mitchell: I do understand that. Just one more comment and I'll get off the subject. Just when you're looking for information, when you look for it that one way that's really helpful. Sometimes if you can't remember when things you know that it was at such and such a meeting, and that's where the cross-referencing makes a big difference. So that's the last plug I'll put in for that.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Discussion of _____? Kathi? Tim?

Ms. Jett: No.

Mr. Raschko: No.

Chair Axthelm: Amy, anything?

Ms. Hughes: I'm fine.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. And down here?

Ms. Candler: I don't have any motion regarding this.

Chair Axthelm: Actually we need – can you go back to the other page? So if we don't have any other issues on that one.... Not really a motion we need to make?

Ms. Lohman: Well, there's people wanted it. There was a request for additional time.

Ms. Candler: That's next.

Chair Axthelm: Yeah, okay, so the next one: too little time for public comment. Who'd we start with the last time? Go ahead and start.

Ms. Rose: I don't have anything.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Amy?

Ms. Hughes: Nothing.

Mr. Raschko: Nothing.

Ms. Lohman: Nothing.

Chair Axthelm: Kathy?

Ms. Mitchell: I think there *is* too little public time for comment. I'd like for the process to be drawn out longer where people could do – some other counties will break things into chapters and have them comment on a little bits, you know, as it goes, and I realize that's quite laborious to do, but if there was a way to build in more time ahead of time when there's such a volume of material. It's pretty daunting. I realize you guys are working as hard as you can, but if there was a way to build in even a bigger buffer when there's huge documents like this I would really appreciate that.

Chair Axthelm: Tammy?

Ms. Candler: Yeah, I don't think more time for time's sake is that valuable. I think people will probably wait until it's time to comment anyway, or coming up maybe. But I do think breaking it down so that people can comment on a manageable amount at a time would be helpful to the process.

Ms. Del Vecchio: I will, I guess, third that, that breaking things into more manageable chunks would make sense to me. If I was trying to participate in this process as a citizen, that would be helpful. And if we're doing that, for example, __ working through the policy discussion before getting to the code amendments seems to make sense. But as far as – I don't know if there's – did the commenter have specific – I can't recall if there was a specific piece of the process that they – or some of the – some certain materials that they didn't feel they had enough time to comment on, or if it was just a general – this we-didn't-have-enough-time. Does anybody recall? I thought there was more to this comment and I can't recall. Okay, I don't have it in front of me so I'm asking for some assistance in – I seem to remember there just being more details as far as specific materials.

Mr. Johnson: I think there were maybe three commenters and I think they all – you know, they cited the number of pages of reading that there were and said that they did not have time to get through them all. I can tell you who the commenters were, if you want. I will look back at –

Ms. Del Vecchio: But there wasn't – I guess what I was saying, Was there something in particular that was not provided far enough in advance or –

Mr. Johnson: I don't recall other than that the time period was not enough time to review and write comments.

Mr. Walters: Although the time period was 42 days, all the documents were provided on the day of release, and we *did* break the subject matter up into topic-oriented portions a year before when we did those workshops on these subjects before. So we tried to do that type of thing well in advance of even releasing the proposal so that we could get that feedback. That may have had more success or less success. Several of you were there so you can be the judge of whether that part of the process worked well or not. But, I mean, we tried that approach.

Chair Axthelm: Tammy, go ahead.

Ms. Candler: And I do think that did help, actually. As from my perspective, I felt more prepared to address it when it came around, having done those, and I can only assume the public would as well – for those who are interested.

Chair Axthelm: Kathy, did you have a comment?

Ms. Mitchell: Yeah, just a reminder for everybody: We do have the ability if one of the commenters is in the audience to ask a clarifying question if they're here and they had commented, and there is that situation here, should you choose to use that.

Ms. Candler: And one more thing: My recollection is – from some comments very recently – that it was kind of a volume issue – just so much material. If that helps.

Mr. Walters: Well, and I would also point out that, for instance, the Comp Plan, it is quite a number of pages but most of the edits in most of the document are very minor – you know, updates of dates and that kind of thing. So the actual number of pages where there are significant edits is much smaller. I don't know what that number is.

Ms. Del Vecchio: But you don't know if they're significant until you read it. So unless it's flagged as significant, minor – I mean, you still have to read through the material to know if it's just a minor edit or a significant one. So hopefully you're able to skim through it a little bit faster if it's just minor, but I think it is – I just want to acknowledge that, that –

Mr. Walters: To some extent that's true. Also with the development regulations I think that we did a – took a new approach of organizing them by topic rather than just going linearly through the code, where in prior approaches to do this number of development regulation amendments you probably would have had hundreds of pages of all this code to look through because so much of it would have been excerpted. So we tried to reduce the volume there.

Ms. Mitchell: One of the things with putting the whole document out – it's great that a lot of people are focusing on just the new stuff, but isn't it not right if we put the whole document out that means the whole document's out for comment, not just the new sections or changed sections?

Mr. Walters: The whole document is out for comment, yeah.

Ms. Mitchell: Right. And that goes for all the portions that go with. So that's – I'm just reminding everybody it's not just the new stuff when we put it out. It is everything is up for comment. And

so, you know, something may have been in there for a number of years, information has changed or attitudes change, people are free to comment.

Chair Axthelm: And my standpoint is that if you have items that you change, then some of those items might actually affect the other items in the plan. So that's where I think that was a little overwhelming. Now I'm familiar with it so it wasn't so hard with me at this point because I've seen it often enough, but it's – it was so extensive. I mean, we had – I'm just throwing a number out – a thousand pages of information to go over if you include all the appendices and the attachments to it. So there's a lot of information to cover. So I think that that as a whole was hard, although we were able to review a good share of it through time. Some of that information may not be complete and then you have to review the whole document to verify that it was – there wasn't anything that affected the other __ or the existing information. So to me that was a little uncomfortable. You know, I had to take some time off of work so I could sit and review it and have you ready for the meeting. And that's not the ideal situation. Amy?

Ms. Hughes: Are we on too little time for public comment or request additional time for review? Which one are we on?

Chair Axthelm: We were on the too little time for public comment.

Ms. Hughes: Okay, no comment.

Chair Axthelm: Although I guess I kind of connected it, that's what we're on. Any other comments on that?

(silence)

Chair Axthelm: So then the next question comes in is request additional time to review. I mentioned it at the beginning of the meeting because I knew about it a little bit, but are we comfortable that we were able to have the time to review the information here?

Ms. Rose: That's a tough one.

Ms. Hughes: Well, I think where the process was – if we wanted to have constructive criticism – is we were all on Shoreline and putting a lot of energy mentally into that, and then all of a sudden we flipped back here. I think we're a little rummy. And so that's where the time review, I would say, is that had we been able to do Shoreline __ and then Comp review – and I know you have calendars and such, but for a volunteer commission it – you had two different employees working on this, two different staffs, but we're having to flip, and so is the public, and I think it's been a tough shift for so big a project.

Mr. Walters: I think we agree that's sub-optimal.

Ms. Hughes: Yeah. And so I think that – you know, I'm happy with powering through and seeing how we do, and try to stay on a schedule.

Chair Axthelm: Kathy?

Ms. Mitchell: Co-signing what Commissioner Hughes is saying, and just so the general public knows, yes, that stuff was up there and available, but just like everybody else the Shoreline stuff is so huge I was focusing all my energy on that thinking we had more time before we hit the

Comprehensive Plan. Then we changed it and so we've had one week to do about 1600 pages and understand what's going on. I'm not complaining to the sense of saying I'm not willing to do that. I am willing to do that but it really is difficult with being able to stay on point and get through the material, and I hope this never happens to any Planning Commission again in the future.

Ms. Candler: And for me it was not knowing which of these that I needed to be the most prepared for, and now that we've kind of put it in order I think the next meetings will be a little bit less overwhelming. But it's still a lot of stuff, but I did come in tonight feeling like a little bit not sure what we were going to be discussing with specificity.

Ms. Del Vecchio: I'll just put it out there that if what I've heard from staff and some others is that the Board is willing to entertain an extension on this. I think we have a stricter deadline on the Shoreline Management Program.

Ms. Lohman: The opposite.

Mr. Pernula: This has the stricter deadline.

Ms. Del Vecchio: No, I don't mean sooner. I don't mean as far as who's telling us it needs to be done by a certain timeline or the consequences for not meeting the deadline is what I meant by stricter. I mean, if the Board is –

Ms. Candler: I'm sorry. I'm not following you.

Ms. Del Vecchio: If the Board is willing to give us an extension on this, then it might – from the sounds of what everybody is saying it might make sense to take advantage of that and give us and the public a little more time with it, and allow us to focus on the Shoreline Management Program. I'm just putting that out there. That was not a motion, just throwing out for discussion.

Chair Axthelm: The public wouldn't have the extra time. It would be us that would have the extra time to review. The public's already had the hearing opportunity.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Well, I'm guessing we could –

Ms. Lohman: But point of clarification from staff: What is the drop-dead date on the Comp Plan?

Mr. Pernula: June 30th.

Ms. Mitchell: What is the drop-dead date for us to be done where the Board of County Commissioners can do their thing?

Mr. Pernula: June 30th.

Ms. Mitchell: So they can move fast.

Mr. Pernula: Well, your deadline's going to have to be obviously be before June 30th.

Ms. Mitchell: That's kind of what I'm getting at. How much lead time do they need really, and for what you have to do?

Mr. Walters: That depends on what it is they *want* to do with it. If there are changes from the original proposal, then they will need – that they want to implement – then they will need an additional period to do a public comment period, and that is a longer period of time than it might seem because there are advertising deadlines. So I was hoping that we would get the Comp Plan to them well before the end of May; however, they don't need very much time to just adopt the original proposal or the original proposal less components because they don't need another comment period for that.

Chair Axthelm: What are the consequences of not meeting that deadline?

Mr. Walters: The June 30th deadline is set by statute. There are no immediate consequences. Now if someone in the County is applying for a grant, they may not be able to check the box that says we're GMA-compliant, because obviously we wouldn't be if we have not adopted a Comp Plan Update, as required by statute. There are things like that. Eventually there are consequences. Eventually there's the potential of sanctions and whatever else the statute allows.

Ms. Del Vecchio: But not within 90 days or –

Mr. Walters: No.

Ms. Del Vecchio: I mean, it's going to take a little while for that to kick in. Yeah, okay.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. And I think it's hard with these type of plans because we think sometimes we have to go through them with a fine tooth comb, but it's next to impossible for us to have all that time to do it, especially on a volunteer board. So really that's not – that's not really what we're expected to do either, but it's making our recommendations on it. Hopefully the staff has gone through it and taken care of a lot of the issues.

Ms. Lohman: I'm not sure everybody agrees with that.

Ms. Mitchell: I don't – yeah –

Chair Axthelm: I'm not saying that I agree with it 100% either, but I'm just – more of a clarification.

Ms. Lohman: I mean, I think we *should* read everything in the proposal, as best as your ability.

Ms. Jett: I have a question – clarification, I guess. I thought that what we were supposed to be looking at were *just* the changes that the – the redlining – and that everything else was – had already been reviewed and commented on and we were not able to comment on that now. Is that wrong?

Chair Axthelm: You're able to comment on all of it.

Ms. Jett: Okay. That's what you said a few minutes ago and that was the first time I had heard that.

Ms. Mitchell: Yeah, that's –

Mr. Walters: You're definitely *able* to comment on all of it, but the Board did adopt a scope of the Update early on in this process with the idea of: We are not rewriting the Comprehensive Plan from scratch. We are trying to make changes to ensure compliance with GMA; to update, you know, for things that are out of date after several years; and to make certain changes that they identified that they wanted done. So the idea is not to plan on making recommendations to change everything else in the plan. The plan – the Board articulated their feeling that they like the plan as it is. They know that it has to be updated every once in a while. And they wanted the scope to be tight and it to get done on time. I think "on time" is relatively flexible, but last time it was two years late and they don't want that to ever happen again. And that can happen. I mean, case in point: Shoreline.

Chair Axthelm: I think the idea is that you've got – with the comments, you have the redline comments but it does affect other areas within the proposal, so other than the Comprehensive Plan. So if it's areas that it affects – if the redline comments affect other areas within it, well then you make comments on that. But you're not trying – what you're saying is you're not trying to make additional proposals that aren't even in the proposal in the first place. Right?

Mr. Walters: Yes. You're trying to avoid mission creep.

Ms. Mitchell: Which is all true and I understand that. And I think that the clarification may be with what you're asking, Kathi, is that was the intent, but Josh is just reminding the public and everybody else when that whole document goes out for comment, it goes out for comment. And so if stuff comes back and gets identified then there's no surprise there, and so consequently I think we're charged with being prepared for knowing the whole document.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Any other comment on the initial review? We have full – we have opportunity to postpone it if we need to.

Next item is the Planning Commission's role in the Update. I guess we've kind of covered a little bit of that.

Mr. Walters: I think that was one of the questions raised during Public Remarks at the beginning tonight, as well. The Planning Commission really was not appointed as the CAC. There is no citizen advisory committee for this Update, nor is there required to be one. So that is pretty much the whole answer to that question. The Planning Commission's role is addressed in the staff report and it's the same as all the legislative land use actions, which is to hold a public hearing, review the proposal, make a recommendation to the Board. And then the Board takes that recommendation and makes a decision as to what it is they want to adopt. And the details on all of that are all in Skagit County Code 14.08, in case you want to read through it all. But it's the same as all the other things that come before you.

Chair Axthelm: It's the Planning Department.

Mr. Walters: To make a recommendation on a proposal. Yeah.

Chair Axthelm: Any other comments on that – the Planning Commission's roles?

(silence)

Chair Axthelm: Okay. So the next item is the CPPs.

Mr. Walters: The CPPs are the Countywide Planning Policies.

Chair Axthelm: Oh, I'm sorry. I jumped. The citizen advisory committee – sorry.

Mr. Walters: Oh, yes, you did skip down.

Chair Axthelm: Citizen advisory committee, and that was made by Hollie and Kathy, so, Hollie?

Ms. Del Vecchio: So I think so that's more of a substantive piece of it. I mean, if we want to start shifting into that, I'm not – because it's not necessarily related to the discussion we were just having about a citizen advisory committee for this process but more the – is that something that we want to be incorporating for the future? This is not coming out clearly.

Chair Axthelm: So it's not related to this, to the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Del Vecchio: It's not related to the current process. I'm not saying we should have had a – this is, you know, a missed element in the process. Because I feel like all the process pieces have been focused on is missed things that we've been deficient in in the current process. That is not my point of bringing the citizen advisory committee discussion forward.

Ms. Mitchell: Nor is mine. I've got a – and it may be that this discussion can go to one of the later items. It's more thinking that we're hearing time and time again from the public about saying that they're not having input from the rural element and those kinds of things. And I've got to agree with reading through a lot of this stuff you hear and see times again, again where there's gaps from good input. And so this is probably not right – the time for this discussion. I think we've got other things higher up on the thing. If we could put this to the bottom of the discussion, meaning at the very end?

Ms. Lohman: Maybe another agenda?

Chair Axthelm: Well, yeah, if this doesn't have to do with the Comprehensive Plan generally then – if it's the process in general, that's different.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Well, I guess I'm not saying that this doesn't have anything to do with the Comprehensive Plan at all. I'm saying it doesn't have to do with the current process that we've been going through, but rather looking at whether it's something that could help us address some of the other transportation and the open space.

Mr. Walters: Maybe it's not a standalone item then for you? Maybe we can hit it –

Ms. Del Vecchio: Yeah, I mean I think it's a – I think some of the comments were specific to transportation. When we have the discussion, I would like to, you know, see if that's truly the focus of it or if there's areas that it could also be helpful. But if we want to throw it in transportation for the sake of discussion – because I think that's where the public comments came – addressed it, and where I think there's, you know, especially high – I think there would be especially high value of having something like that in place for transportation purposes. So if it makes sense to roll it into the transportation element, that might –

Ms. Lohman: I would like to kind of make a general comment about what I think, and if I'm going off a cliff and it's not what you're thinking, pull me back. But it's real easy for a committee that's focused on a single topic to have tunnel vision, its single purpose. And when you don't

have input from other entities that may be affected, they're not part of that special committee. And there's danger in that because not all of the big picture is presented. And so just because there's a committee or somebody has a passion for something – and they're not wrong in that pursuit, but there's more elements that feed into whatever project they might be working on that maybe never got heard because of it being kind of isolated.

Ms. Del Vecchio: I think that's the kind of discussion I would like to have: Is this something that would have – I think it's – to me, it's more than just providing a voice for people that would like to participate on a certain issue. It's also recognizing that there's only so much that we can do and there are certain areas where we could use help from the public in identifying where the needs are and really kind of fleshing out some of the issues. So part of it comes down to how it's structured. But mostly I would just – I would like to at least have the discussion and maybe that discussion affects whether we think it's a good idea, how it's structured. But I think it's – this process, just the workload, the number of issues that we feel we're not able to really address thoroughly, and the public's response that they haven't had enough input to me. And I feel like we've heard repeatedly times just since I've been on the Commission is interest in having some kind of a citizens advisory board, especially for, you know, transportation. So, you know, whether it's something that as a planning commission we want to advance or not as a, I would like to have the discussion.

Chair Axthelm: _____. We're okay down here? We've got a quiet side over here. You guys are okay? All right. Okay, go ahead, Tammy.

Ms. Candler: Okay, for a clarification: I sort of understood that in the Process section of our discussions, but unless you're saying that we're actually going to recommend putting this in the Comp Plan, I don't see where that discussion belongs anywhere else here. I don't know that that's even an option. Is that – Ryan, can I ask a question? Would we – would we put that in a Comp Plan or would that be something that we would make –

Mr. Walters: You could make a recommendation to create, say, a Public Works commission. I think that department would *love* that. But I think that would be contrary to the mission creep angle that I discussed earlier. But, yeah, you could make – we could assumedly have a Comp Plan policy that said – just like we have policies that say create Ag Advisory Board, create Forestry Advisory Board, we could have policy that says create a Public Works commission.

Ms. Candler: Okay, so we –

Mr. Johnson: If I could – I think Commissioner Del Vecchio may be responding to – I think there were a couple commenters who, under the transportation section under the non-motorized section, said, We would like to see a non-motorized citizen advisory committee. I think we've also heard from another commenter throughout this process that the Board should have created a citizen advisory committee for this process. We already do have citizen advisory committees that are focused on agriculture and forestry. And the UGA Open Space Plan, the implementation section – and that's one of the issues you'll be talking about – talks about creating a UGA Open Space Implementation Committee. So, you know, I think there are multiple different ways you could have this conversation, and it may be, you know, everybody, based on what their strongest interest is, may want a committee to help represent that interest. And I think the flip side of that is, How many committees can the County have and help the staff and maintain and the like? So I think if an individual Planning Commission member wants to talk about an advisory committee for a specific subject, and certainly, you know, you could recommend a policy that the Board of County Commissioners should appoint a citizen advisory

committee to help do x, y, or z, and you're the ones who need to decide where you think what the x, y, and z are, and there may be different opinions among each of you and some members of the public.

Ms. Candler: Okay, so let's say we didn't put it in the Comp Plan. What other mechanism would there be to institute a citizen advisory committee on one of these areas? Like, could we – would this be something that we could put on an agenda after the Comp Plan is done and get something rolling for the next one without putting it in the Plan?

Chair Axthelm: Okay, point of order. If we are talking about the Comp Plan tonight – deliberations for the Comp Plan – we should keep it to the Comp Plan. So if we can't directly apply it to the Comp Plan –

Ms. Candler: That's my – that's –

Chair Axthelm: – we should put that to later discussion. I'm sorry – yeah, yeah.

Ms. Candler: That is my whole question.

Mr. Walters: Yeah, the County Commissioners –

Chair Axthelm: I was trying to get to that before you –

Mr. Walters: The County Commissioners can create committees whenever they want and they do from time to time, but the Planning Commission's authority is limited to reviewing Comp Plan proposals and development regulation proposals.

Ms. Lohman: But structurally we could also have committees – sub-committees – if you wanted to.

Mr. Walters: The Planning Commission itself?

Ms. Candler: You mean within our membership?

Ms. Lohman: Within our – on the Planning Commission.

Mr. Walters: The Planning Commission itself could create committees of itself. It could not create committees that involve members of the public and all of that. That creates many other problems.

Ms. Candler: But if we did that, we still wouldn't be putting it in the Comp Plan. Am I –

Ms. Lohman: No.

Ms. Candler: Am I right? Okay. I have to agree with Josh that it's probably point of order not for this discussion, unfortunately.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Okay. And I guess I view it more the way that Kirk just described it where it would actually be a recommended policy to include in the Comp Plan so that we have it moving forward rather than something that comes up when we go into the next update. So I guess I'm

viewing it a little bit differently and – but if it's not something that we want to discuss, then fine. I will – no, that's –

Chair Axthelm: If it doesn't have to do directly with the Comp Plan and it has to do with the Planning Commission in general, then we should postpone that to later discussions. But if we have – like, citizen advisory committee for the transportation portion of it, if there's a recommendation that we have a citizen advisory committee then that's a little different situation because it applies directly to the Comp Plan.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Okay, but why is what I'm saying not that?

Ms. Candler: I guess the question would be if a Planning Commissioner's going to have a motion to put that in, that's something we should discuss. If not, then it's not proper for this discussion.

Ms. Del Vecchio: I likely would like to move for something like that –

Ms. Candler: Okay, then it should be in there.

Ms. Del Vecchio: – when we get there, but we're not there yet. It makes more sense to make that motion when we're discussing the transportation or wherever it is that I think that would be helpful. So I would rather it not be taken off the table before I even get there.

Chair Axthelm: No, no, no. I wasn't saying take it off the table. I was just saying if general discussion – as far as general discussion. But if you have something you want to have a citizen advisory go to then yes, later on.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Which is really where we started. I was just trying to get it in the transportation section.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ms. Del Vecchio: I'm just trying to get it out of the process discussion and into the transportation discussion is really all I was looking for tonight!

Chair Axthelm: So why don't we do that then? Move that down to the transportation section. Is that –

Ms. Mitchell: Fine with me.

Ms. Del Vecchio: That would be wonderful. Thank you.

Chair Axthelm: And there may be somewhere else, if somebody wants to see it – if there's things that need to be developed. Okay. So, with that, the next one. Are we at the – is that where we're at, is the appendices? Okay. Appendices discussion.

Ms. Hughes: May I – point of order or whatever? Could we spend the next bit of time – so our minds can get wrapped around this – really organizing what we're going to talk about next meeting, when the next meeting will be? Give ourselves all a break to come in focused on what we're going to be doing in the next meeting, let staff do their reports. Would that be agreeable?

Mr. Walters: Well, and we have already generated as part of Staff Report #1 responses to comments on all the issues that don't have initials next to them, because those were public comment issues. The ones with initials next to them are ones that you added tonight, and some of them we could respond to; some of them not because we're not – I'm not really sure what some of them are.

Ms. Del Vecchio: An appendices was already there, right? I think Kathy –

Ms. Mitchell: It was. I just said put a tick for me next to it.

Mr. Walters: Oh, so we added for that one.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Right. So maybe if we moved open space back so we were able to – I was just thinking for staff's sake so that it's not – if those are – those open space items – are ones that staff hasn't had a chance to respond to yet and we're not going to potentially be given the report on that until Friday then –

Mr. Walters: Well, we anticipate sending out the next staff report tomorrow.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Oh. Okay then.

Mr. Walters: This is not Shoreline. But trail head markers – unless that's something different, I think we already talked about that in Shoreline. So it's basically the same concept so I don't know that we would address that again.

Integration of Open Space Plan. I think we could talk about that really briefly right now. Property rights and public access, though, are very broad topics so I don't know what we would talk about there. And food security, I – unless Kirk has insight into that one....

Mr. Johnson: I will only say that the staff report that you received last week starts out responding to the comments on the Countywide Planning Policies and then moves into the Comprehensive Plan, and the first, you know, substantive, kind of critical mass of comments on the Comprehensive Plan was about the policy on the Open Space Plan where we're proposing to replace the policy that says "By December 31st of 2007, Skagit County shall adopt a UGA Open Space Plan" with a policy that says Skagit County should at some point in time implement that plan. And there were various comments in support of that policy and some not in support of that policy. So that, to me, based on the public comments, is kind of the substantive issue around the UGA Open Space Plan, and if there are other issues that people want to talk in relation to that – yeah, I can guess at what food security means, what property rights or public access, but they're not addressed in here, other than unless there was a specific comment that we responded to. So I guess I'm just – you know, the comments on the Comp Plan – the Countywide Planning Policies and the Comp Plan were addressed sequentially as you move through the plan – Introduction, the Land Use Element, the Rural Element. So I don't know if you want to jump into Open Space right now or not.

Mr. Walters: And I didn't want to get too far afield from what Commissioner Hughes was suggesting, just that I think largely with maybe very few exceptions we've already addressed all the stuff in the policies and map section in Staff Report #1. Staff Report #2 will address the development regulations section. So I don't mean to interrupt your attempt to organize this list, but I just don't want you to expect that we will produce more reports on the items on the policy list.

Chair Axthelm: I think I'm understanding Commissioner Hughes. Is it there are some items on this list that we may not want – even though it's in this particular order – we've set it in this order based on subject – we may want to say, Okay, let's say – for example – open space and say we're not ready for that. Let's postpone that till last time and go farther down on the list. So do you want to go down through the items now and say we feel comfortable to cover that? Get a few more things done tonight or do you want to just go through the whole list in general?

Ms. Hughes: However the Planning Commission wants to go forward. I'm just trying to be efficient with our time.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ms. Lohman: A suggestion, Mr. Chairman?

Chair Axthelm: Yes.

Ms. Lohman: We were given this March 8th, 2016, staff report. It doesn't have a number so I'm assuming it's the first one. It's the giant one with 63 pages. I really think that's the basis for us to follow and I thought that the Supplemental Staff Report followed that, because I sat there with the Comp Plan on my screen and I had my thing and I flipped back and forth, and so I think we should stay in the order on that original staff report. And it's methodical and orderly, and we've already taken out the citizen-initiated Comp Plan amendments, except for the Sedro-Woolley one. And so, to me, I think we should do that – as a suggestion.

Ms. Del Vecchio: That makes sense to me. I think the one thing that – for me for next week as I'm preparing, it might be nice to know in advance that, okay, we are simply going to agree in advance that we are not getting to development regulations that night. I'm thinking there's a – you know, we most likely won't but, you know, for instance, for tonight with just the chance that, Oh, we might absolutely just breeze through all of this stuff. So you're trying to cover everything, which makes it really hard to break things into chunks and focus on them, because you're okay, well, we *might* get to development regulations so I'd better prepare for that as well. If we were to just say, All right, if we finish at 7:45, great. We leave a little bit early and just know we have – we're coming back the next time to focus on the development regulations. That would be helpful to me. Then we can focus on the policy pieces for next week. But that would just be one example.

Ms. Candler: I think that's a great idea.

Chair Axthelm: And that's the reason we edited the list, is we wanted to make sure that we had a path to follow. Because, really, we followed this report pretty closely so far because we've just got through the first items. But we edited the list and added items that aren't on here that went inside, so –

Ms. Lohman: But I'm wondering if they're actually subtopics of when we get to that _____.

Mr. Johnson: There are some topics that have a lot of subtopics.

Ms. Mitchell: Most of them are.

Chair Axthelm: Yep.

Ms. Candler: So the chances of us –

Ms. Lohman: I mean, they're mostly just bullet points that somebody's going to bring up, but I don't think they're – I think they're just markers to remember.

(sounds of agreement)

Chair Axthelm: So for clarity of the new members, we need to make sure we're consistent.

Ms. Candler: In my mind, that makes Hollie's suggestion make a lot of sense. We're likely to be able to fill a whole meeting with, first of all, Sedro-Woolley and then the CPP and Comp Plan, before we ever get to – so it might make sense not to have to prepare for development regulations. So I would agree with her on that.

Ms. Mitchell: If that's the case I think we're going to be using May 24th, right? Okay.

Ms. Candler: I mean, unless somebody thinks it's realistic that we're going to get through all of that.

Ms. Lohman: But I would like a clarification on a development reg item because I've seen it written several different ways so now I'm not sure. Is that all right, so we know what we're studying?

Ms. Mitchell: I think so.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, hold it. So you're going to development regulation now?

Ms. Candler: She's just –

Ms. Lohman: I want to know – are we talking about junk cars? Junk? Because you'd written on the thing "junk vehicles and abandoned RVs." Well, that's a way different scenario than just "junk." Because – so what is it?

Chair Axthelm: Okay, that's a point of order there, because I think we've established a list of things we're going to talk about.

Ms. Lohman: Okay. Let's just –

Chair Axthelm: And I want to. It's important. It's just that you jump to a total different subject from where we were.

Ms. Lohman: All right. Good. Fine. But let's move along.

Chair Axthelm: Where do we – if we're at the appendices or do we want to miss the appendices and move on to something different and come back to those?

Mr. Johnson: You know the May 3rd staff memo starts with the Countywide Planning Policies because those are kind of the framework of the Comprehensive Plan, and then they move, as I said, sequentially through the Comprehensive Plan, and the appendices actually come at the end of the Comprehensive Plan. So I think – well, I know we can keep the same issues and just

move them around a little bit and at least be in the order of the May 3rd memo, which, as Commissioner Lohman said, is generally in the order of the proposal and the way the Comprehensive Plan is laid out. So I think that might be the most logical way to go about it.

Chair Axthelm: Does that please the Commission?

(sounds of assent)

Chair Axthelm: Or is anybody objecting to that, I should say. Okay. All right. So the first thing we'll cover is – do you want to move to the CPPs or open space tonight? _____ 20 minutes ____.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Can we – yeah, I think if we're jumping into a completely different area –

Ms. Lohman: I thought we were done deliberating. We are just going around and around.

Chair Axthelm: You're talking multiple different items. So we can take part of the items tonight and do them, or pick – let's pick *something* and move on. Where do we want to start?

Ms. Del Vecchio: Are we going – how long do we plan on going this evening?

Chair Axthelm: Because we may not even get through CPPs in one night. That's up to you. Till nine o'clock? Is that good for the Commission?

Ms. Mitchell: I'm willing to work as late as people want to work.

Ms. Candler: Are we – I don't see a Department Update on the agenda so I guess we're doing deliberations all the way up till we adjourn, right?

(sounds of assent)

Chair Axthelm: You don't have – do you have an update for us tonight?

Mr. Pernula: Pardon?

Chair Axthelm: There's no Department Update for us tonight?

Mr. Pernula: Not really. I have something I'd like to hand out real quick.

Chair Axthelm: All right. It's up to you guys. Where do you want to start? I mean, I can say, Let's do this, but that's up to you. So where do we feel comfortable starting?

Ms. Jett: Well, shall we address some of the really easy ones if there are quick, easy ones in open space, such as trail head markers? I mean, how much discussion do we need on that?

Chair Axthelm: Open space?

Ms. Jett: No, I mean just the sub – this little bulleted trail head markers, or food security.

Mr. Johnson: Could I suggest, based on the staff memo and the order of the proposal, that – I mean, there were only two comments on the CPPs so I'm personally not thinking that's going to be a huge issue of discussion. I could be wrong.

Chair Axthelm: Oh, you just didn't move it down. Okay. So if we move CPPS up –

Mr. Johnson: But I actually think open space probably will be a lengthy conversation and so I think starting it at 20 to – or 17 to 9 is probably not a good idea.

Chair Axthelm: Does that work for the Commission?

Mr. Raschko: It works.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ms. Candler: I have something that's not a Department Update but it's more of a question about next week. It's kind of a Department Update question.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Do we want to wait till after we're finished – go ahead.

Ms. Candler: I think we are finished. That's my prediction! You guys said that you invited somebody to speak next week. Who? I forget who you said?

Mr. Johnson: We've invited, not necessarily to speak but to be here as resources, someone from the Public Works Department, someone from the Skagit Council of Governments, and someone from the local office of the State Department of Transportation. We want to be able to be very clear to you what the requirements are for the County's Transportation Element and what level of detail those requirements are and what level of detail those requirements aren't. And we're finding that it's a complicated issue and we think it will require having those three bodies there to help provide that, and it can definitely be on the basis of as-you-have-questions.

Ms. Candler: Then I would suggest we put those at the top. That's my recommendation.

Chair Axthelm: Oh, I see – for next week.

Ms. Candler: For next week.

Chair Axthelm: Yeah. Yes, and that was actually part of the – okay. So as far as today, before we move them, is there anything else we want to cover in the next 15 minutes or are we –

Ms. Mitchell: I think we could hit the wildfire planning and get it done.

Ms. Candler: I need to make a motion to move transportation up.

Chair Axthelm: No, transportation we'll cover next week but – oh, okay, do you want to plan? Okay.

Ms. Candler: Yeah, I want to move transportation up. Does anyone second?

Chair Axthelm: Is that the will of the Commission – to stop the discussion tonight and to plan? All those in favor?

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. All right, so let's ___ transportation? You want to move (it) up to the top before CPPs?

Ms. Candler: Yes, just based on the fact that we'll have people here to talk to us about it. I just don't want to not get to them.

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ms. Lohman: Can we not abbreviate so that everybody knows what we're talking about?

Chair Axthelm: Okay, yeah. So Comprehensive –

Ms. Lohman: Plan Policy.

Chair Axthelm: Can we write that out? Countywide – sorry. All right, and transportation. Was there some items – was that directly relating to the Open Space Plan?

Mr. Johnson: No, not at all. Would you like us to add as sub-bullets the different items that we identified in the Supplemental Staff Report responding to public comments? Okay, because, you know, there are some comments related to non-motorized transportation. There are some under transportation. There are some related to the need for a 20-year financial plan. There are some related to extending or encouraging freight rail to Concrete. So they would be discrete items.

Mr. Walters: What we did before with Shorelines was just go through the staff report.

Mr. Johnson: Okay.

Mr. Walters: Because then you see the comment and see the response and you recommend a change. And since it's largely still in the same order, that might be the easiest way.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Then the sub-bullets here were just add-ons, so not – so we still cover all of the transportation as it's addressed in the staff report, but then these are the four things that we want to add on in addition to, is I think how it works.

Mr. Johnson: Or I could see some of them being integrated into some of those discussions.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Yeah.

Chair Axthelm: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Johnson: So we won't add sub-bullets but you'll know that –

Chair Axthelm: We'll still follow the staff report.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. And then the next one, Countywide Planning Policies – does that sound all right?

(sounds of assent)

Mr. Walters: So the rest of the list then will just be in the order of the staff report and plan?

Chair Axthelm: Can we see that a little bit bigger view so we've got not just – so we can see the rest of the list?

Mr. Johnson: Point of clarification for your sake and ours: Does it go Sedro-Woolley UGA then transportation, or does Sedro-Woolley UGA now move to the end?

Mr. Walters: Oh, right.

Ms. Candler: I would recommend that we do transportation first just because we'll have people here, then Sedro-Woolley – not moving it to the end but moving it after transportation but before CPPs and Comp Plan. Does anyone –

Ms. Mitchell: That's polite for the guests.

Chair Axthelm: Does that work?

Mr. Walters: I bet John Coleman comes back.

Ms. Candler: He may be. That's true, but –

Chair Axthelm: Yeah.

Ms. Del Vecchio: He can wait till we get through transportation.

Chair Axthelm: Which would be appropriate if he's – yeah.

Mr. Walters: He's already waited a week.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. So then Countywide Planning Policies and then are there any other items that we're feeling uncomfortable about discussing that possibly we want to have more time on?

Ms. Candler: I don't know yet. I don't think we know yet.

Chair Axthelm: Let's just scroll down a little bit.

Ms. Mitchell: I think that we could hit the appendices tonight and get it off the list, if everybody else is willing to just discuss it and get it over with.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Yeah, if we can just do it.

Chair Axthelm: Just before it, let's roll down the rest of the list and double-check. Is there any other order that we want to have on these items?

Mr. Walters: Well, that's the end of the list until –

Chair Axthelm: Okay. We just couldn't see – I could only see "Development Regulations" – top of. It didn't show anything more besides just the heading before. Okay. So does that work? Amy?

Ms. Hughes: Sure.

Chair Axthelm: Does that feel more comfortable? So if we're okay with that list, then we can move to the – we can go ahead and cover the appendices.

Mr. Johnson: If you want to draw on the staff report responding to the major comments, those are discussed on 18, page 18. If you want to just go from your own thoughts, that's your – at your discretion.

Ms. Mitchell: So since I – I think it's a big deal just for having the information. If we're splitting a lot of things out of the Comp Plan policies into appendices, I think it's important to keep a historical record of what the different plans were and also the various lists of things that were built into it. If it's going to be separate anyway, I think that information is valuable for anybody that pieces things together, and there are those of us that do. So from a historical perspective, that's my thoughts.

Chair Axthelm: Annie?

Ms. Lohman: Question for staff: Kirk, these appendices that were deleted, they basically are obsolete going forward, correct? They've been replaced, right? Is that what you were intending to say?

Mr. Johnson: That's our perspective. I think I'd like to defer to Ryan on this because I think he has – he's kind of the most passionate about this issue.

Mr. Walters: There're a couple different appendices here. If you take, first of all, Appendix B and glance through it, there's a lot of detail. Well, first of all, just take Appendix B. You won't find it in your proposal because we're proposing to eliminate it.

Mr. Johnson: Actually I think Appendix B would –

Mr. Walters: Is that the one we're keeping?

Mr. Johnson: That's the one that would remain but it would be as it currently is – track major milestones through the development of the '97 Comp Plan and then, I believe, ending at the adoption of the '97 Comp Plan. So that's kind of a historical – you know, this is how we got to the County's first GMA-based Comprehensive Plan. That would stay but it wouldn't be added to because as it is right now it stops, I think, in May or June of 1997 when that Comprehensive Plan was adopted. It's the following two appendices; one is related plans or ___ plans, several of which are 20 years old, and there are some legal implications to having them as an appendix of the Comprehensive Plan that we would like to get away from.

Ms. Lohman: Well, my question was I understand if they've been updated or replaced, but where do you plan to store some of those, like the Watershed Plan? It scrolled past me so quick I couldn't grab it but I did look at it. The Bayview one, for example – where do you store those things so that if you needed to see what they are?

Mr. Walters: Well, so this is Appendix C here, so this is one of the ones we're proposing –

Ms. Lohman: Is this the way you're going to leave it?

Mr. Johnson: Right.

Mr. Walters: No. B was the one we were just going to leave alone, as Kirk described – just mark it as historical and not keep updating it. It went through 2007?

Mr. Johnson: No, '97, I believe – the adoption of the '97 Comp Plan.

Mr. Walters: This one, Appendix C, lists other plans. It would be incorrect to say that they are adopted as part of the Comp Plan. We definitely would not want to say that because they are not. We might say that they are just other plans that are floating out there, but why would we? The 1976 Shoreline Management Plan is not in effect after we adopt the new one. The 1993 Skagit County Drainage Study is not the latest edition drainage study. I mean, just go down the list. The school district's capital facilities plans – that doesn't really tell you anything. Anacortes doesn't have one. The others are updated on an infrequent basis. This is not useful information, I guess. We could turn this maybe into useful information by going through and identifying all the current plans, but what would be the point of that? Some of the capital facilities plans are incorporated into the County's Comprehensive Plan and have to be in order to levy impact fees. But when we do that, we do it very deliberately because we have to look at them, we make a statement in the Capital Facilities Plan – in our own – to incorporate them by reference. We do not just throw at a wall a list of all the plans that are out there. If we just want to maintain an archive of stuff, we can do that with the actual documents someplace else, and we've talked about ways to accomplish that. And on our Comprehensive Plan page now, we do have a list to – well, let me show you it. On our Comprehensive Plan webpage right now – that's this here – at the bottom we have other plans that are part of the Comprehensive Plan and those are all linked, and then there are historical documents below. There you actually get to read the plans. In the appendix, you just get a title. So I see that as very little value. I am a strong advocate of maintaining less stuff that doesn't have value and I think that Appendix C is largely just a list of things that – without a lot of value in the list itself.

Now Appendix D is very similar – Adopting and Amending Ordinances. There's some value to having this list, but the list won't go away as part of the 2007 Plan. It's on the website. Also the ordinances themselves are all available on the website. But this list only goes through 2006 and there have been many ordinances since then and we are not very interested in summarizing all of them and listing them all. All of them are available on the County's website and, more importantly, they're all codified – with the exception of plans – they're codified into the County Code, which is where we look, as staff, to read ordinances – through the Code, not through the ordinance texts themselves. So in the interest of having an easily updatable, usable document, we would like to not maintain these lists.

Ms. Lohman: I guess my question goes back to, too, is why did you do it in the first place in an older plan? Why did you –

Mr. Walters: That's a good question.

Unidentified female in the audience: Because you used it to write the Plan. You used that information writing the Plan. Did you not, Kirk?

Mr. Johnson: Ryan?

Chair Axthelm: Sorry – the public –

Mr. Walters: Let us just talk about that for just a second. We did not use all the ordinances going back to 1997 to write the Plan. I mean, that doesn't – that doesn't really make sense. It's just a list of stuff.

Mr. Johnson: At the beginning in the Introduction of this proposed updated Plan, there's a list of specific reports that were relied on in updating the Plan, and then if somebody wanted to know what – Ryan, could you go back to the Comp Plan webpage? If somebody wanted to know what documents were in the appendix in the – go down a little bit – the 2000 Comprehensive Plan, they can go there on the website. We'll put the 2007 Comprehensive Plan up there when we have a 2016 Comprehensive Plan. So it's not like Appendix C is lost to history. You would just need to go back to those versions of the Plan when it was a relevant appendix. And what we're saying is at this point a 1993 Puget Sound Energy Network Plan is not a relevant document, especially when we reference in the Comprehensive Plan the 2015 Puget Sound Energy Utilities Plan.

Mr. Walters: There's a separate but related problem, too, that Kirk alluded to. At the beginning of the Comprehensive Plan – the 2007 Plan – there is a list of plans with some sort of an inexact wording as to what their value is – this is at the beginning in the Preface – and that has caused us problems in the past. Are those plans – other plans part of the Comprehensive Plan? Are they incorporated by reference? I'm not currently providing legal advice, but when I was providing legal advice I strongly indicated that we need to be careful about which plans are incorporated by reference and which are not, and really incorporate by reference the plans that we need to have in there to fulfill some GMA objective. So that is a separate issue, but it's related. We need to be careful about these things for Appendix – this last Appendix D, though.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, so are we talking about the actual appendix in the Comprehensive Plan or are we talking about the list of items that you have at the beginning in the Introduction that lists the appendix and stuff?

Mr. Walters: I'm – I think that the public comments were about Appendix C and D, but I'm saying that as a general matter we need to be careful because these lists have occurred elsewhere, as well.

Chair Axthelm: Yeah.

Ms. Mitchell: I think the main assurance that people would want is that access to information that was used in the past is still accessible. I think that's largely part of it, is being able to easily find something, or the archived materials or knowing how things maybe changed over time. There are historians but sometimes it's good learning tools to do that. So I think this complaint here, I can identify with because I do think that people want to be assured that they can find older information, because there are nuggets of gold in the old information, even if it is 20 years old.

Mr. Walters: And we have a tremendous electronic archive of stuff – GMA documents, the GMA record – that we cannot expose to the web because everything we put on the web requires an e-mail. So we have asked for some solutions to that. There are possible solutions, but we have to work through other departments to obtain that.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Departments Planning and Permit, Carol.

(several Commissioners talking at once)

Chair Axthelm: Starting at page 412.

Ms. Candler: Skagit County Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Mitchell: So maybe it can be more simply addressed is to put that in recommendations when it comes to that point in time that the Board looks into bettering the archives or the accessibility to the archives.

Ms. Lohman: So are we going to make a decision on the appendices? Or not?

Chair Axthelm: Is there any other comments?

Ms. Candler: Is there a motion, I guess would be the question.

Chair Axthelm: I had some confusion on that so I was skimming through it.

Ms. Mitchell: Well, if you guys are up to it, I'll make it a motion – just to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners to look into better archiving and accessibility for the public. Does that – I'm getting tired. Is that making sense?

Mr. Walters: That would be outside the scope of the recommendations on the Plan itself.

Ms. Mitchell: Well, for the things that were tied here before.

Ms. Lohman: I was thinking in a deliberative motion. Either accept what the staff suggested or something different, not launch into how we should write a website.

Ms. Del Vecchio: And I think to be consistent with how we were addressing the Shoreline Management Program, if – and staff can correct me if I'm wrong – but if we're just in agreement and we don't see anything that needs to be changed then we don't necessarily need a motion.

Mr. Walters: Correct.

Mr. Johnson: Right, but if there's a member who wants to not go with the staff recommendation then they would need to make a motion to go back to how the Plan currently is.

Ms. Lohman: But we need to make a statement then on how we are going so we're not wishy-washy.

Ms. Mitchell: Well, I guess the question is, Am I the only one that this is a concern to or is this a moot point?

Ms. Candler: Where do we want to start? Do you have something? Because I do. My thought is that the staff – my concern is that, you know, not just the legality, as Ryan indicated – which is probably a concern – but your average citizen looking at this thing can really get bogged down, and I think that having it in a separate archived location streamlines our actual Plan, and that they both have value, but I think I would lean on the side of trying to keep them in an archive and not part of the document itself. And so I don't have a motion regarding this.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. So I'm just look – I got thrown off because I was looking at the Introduction earlier for some reason. I came across, at least on the Appendix, in the Introduction summary. What you were saying – there's different locations where it's noted in the Plan? Do you know what I'm talking about? What I showed you earlier today.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah. So on page 8 of the – I guess it's called the Contents, there's a list of appendices, so basically that shows Appendix A and B as they currently are; current C and D go away; and new C becomes the Transportation Element Technical Appendix, which was the Transportation Systems Plan outside of the Comprehensive Plan. It's being downsized and moved into the Comprehensive Plan. Then I think you had a question about the related studies and plans below that which currently they're called the Technical Appendices under separate cover. I think that gets into some concerns that Ryan had. So now we're simply saying these are related studies and plans, and they were used in development and implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Axthelm: But we're not approving those and those are not part of the Comprehensive Plan. Is that correct?

Mr. Walters: Exactly.

Mr. Johnson: You would need to ask Ryan or Jill.

Chair Axthelm: And if that gets clarified I think it simplifies this, because right now it's hard to tell whether it's included as part of the Plan or as a reference. And that's why if you put it at the end of the document you could tell: Okay, it's the reference. But here it looks like it's kind of integrated within the document.

Mr. Walters: Well, we tried to make it clear in the introductory sentence. These are the documents that actually were used in the development and implementation of the Comprehensive Plan, but they *aren't* the Comprehensive Plan – versus the list of things above. If you wanted to make an even clearer statement of that, I would be supportive of very clearly indicating what's part of it, what's not. Also there was a comment – one of the public comments on capital facilities said, Well, where's your inventory? Well, the inventory's in that yearly update that you do, and one of the recommendations in the staff report is to make that very clear, in case it wasn't already, that the yearly update is part of the Comprehensive Plan, because it really needs to be. So we could address that.

Ms. Mitchell: Okay.

Chair Axthelm: I personally don't feel comfortable right now understanding all that and putting it together. I'd rather have more time to vote on it. Kathy?

Ms. Mitchell: I'm fine with waiting. Just as a final note, I would like to see it as clear as possible.

Ms. Lohman: I mean, I could agree with waiting to vote but I also see the value in staying pertinent, because you can get down a rabbit hole on something that's irrelevant or obsolete.

Chair Axthelm: That's the issue.

Ms. Lohman: And that – yeah, _____. But I also agree that there is historic value on why something in the past was done a certain way. But when you're updating the 2016 Plan, the documents related to it should be relevant to the 2016 Plan.

Chair Axthelm: Okay, so do we have a motion for this?

Ms. Lohman: They asked to wait.

Chair Axthelm: Just wait. No, I mean anything else to cover.

Ms. Del Vecchio: Motion to adjourn.

Chair Axthelm: What's that?

Ms. Lohman: Second.

Chair Axthelm: I heard a motion to adjourn. Okay. Yes, Dale?

Mr. Pernula: Can I pass out something I just mentioned real quick?

Chair Axthelm: Yep.

Mr. Pernula: Okay, last week the Board of County Commissioners adopted the resolution that you have, and why I want to just mention it to you is that it will affect what you guys are doing, more the second half of this year than the first half. In addition to these legislative items that we have in the resolution, the Planning Department has also been working on two pretty large EISs, so we've been very well – our agenda's been set for the first half of this year pretty heavily.

So as far as the work program and the resolution that they adopted goes, in the legislative work program you can see that the first two items are the Comprehensive Plan Update and the Shoreline Master Program Update, and we expect those to be out the door by the end of June; however, we know that the SMP, we may get comments back from Ecology and we may have to do some amendments, and we're suggesting that those could be done by probably June of next year.

After the Planning Commission is done with the Shoreline Master Program and the Comprehensive Plan Update, the next item that is listed – it says "Rural Forestry Initiative, Transfer of Forest Practices Jurisdiction, and Clearing Regulations." That's probably the highest priority item. It still has a lot of work to be done on it. We have prepared a paper that researches the statutes and what other Counties are doing in similar situations, and so we have a general direction we would like to go on it. I met with the Forestry Advisory Board this morning. But it will be probably one of the main projects you work on sometime this fall.

Also once again you'll have the Capital Facilities Plan Update and the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Amendments. We don't know what those will be yet until we get applications for those various map changes.

So those are the major legislative items that the Planning Department will be working on, and you will certainly be involved in some of those as well. And I just wanted you to be aware of what's coming up this fall.

On the following pages are other projects that the Department is working on, but they're not – some of them are those legislative projects but there are others listed there as well that are not legislative. So just for your reference, these are the things that we're working on. That's all I have.

Chair Axthelm: Okay. Anything else the Planning Commission ___? Is there anything we need to discuss at the end of the meeting or not?

(silence)

Chair Axthelm: Okay.

Ms. Del Vecchio: There is a motion on the table.

Chair Axthelm: The motion's on the table to adjourn. Any objection to adjourning? No? (gavel)
The meeting's adjourned.