

**Skagit County Planning Commission  
Public Hearing: 2018 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposals  
August 21, 2018**

**Planning**

**Commissioners:**

Tim Raschko, Chair  
Kathy Mitchell, Vice Chair  
Tammy Candler  
Annie Lohman  
Hollie Del Vecchio  
Mark Lundsten  
Amy Hughes  
Josh Axthelm (absent)  
Martha Rose (absent)

**Staff:**

Hal Hart, Planning Director  
Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner

**Public Hearing**

**Commenters:**

**Speaking on Docket Items C-1 through C-18:**

Brandon Roozen, Western WA Agricultural Advisory Committee  
Allen Rozema, Skagitonians to Preserve Farmland  
Don McMoran

**Speaking on Docket Item PL17-0414:**

Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County  
Jay Lewis  
Art Fournier  
Karl Seume, Quaker Cove Retreat  
Liz Seume, Quaker Cove Retreat  
Shannon Redmond

**Speaking on Docket Item P-2:**

Allen Rozema, Skagitonians to Preserve Farmland  
Brandon Rozema, Western WA Agricultural Advisory Committee  
Roger Wechsler, Samish Bay Cheese  
Terry Sapp

**Speaking on Docket Item P-12:**

Vincent Henley  
Pam Doddridge  
Tom Conroy  
Gary Hagland, Citizens Alliance for Property Rights, Skagit Chapter  
Tom Wooten, Samish Indian Nation  
Steve Verbarendse  
Tom Glade, Evergreen Islands  
Bill Doddridge  
Mark Tibbles

**Judy Pepper  
Teru Lundsten  
Bill Redding  
Jason Redding  
Andy Culbertson  
Glen Strebe  
Scott W. Johnson  
Jim McCarthy  
Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County  
Glenn Dalgliesh  
Meredith Lesley  
Howard Gulley  
Krysta Verbarendse  
John Enga  
Katherine Pittis  
John Flowers  
Patty Wasson  
Bob Shelly  
James (Jim) Kenote  
Corinne Salcedo  
Richard Bergner  
Maetja Verbarendse  
Austin Portis  
Katie Rowley  
Ashley Rowley  
Wim Houppermans  
Laure Sherman  
Jan Heald Robinson  
Roger Pearce  
Tim Lewis  
Cindy Petrich  
Konrad Kurp  
Kamiyo Culbertson  
Bill Wooding  
Dawn Greenfield  
Paul Weisz  
Bryce Nickel  
Brian Wetcher, Evergreen Islands  
Kathleen Lorence-Flanagan  
George Wolner**

Chair Tim Raschko: (gavel) Good evening, everybody, and welcome to the August 21, 2018, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission. Have all the Commissioners had the opportunity to review the agenda? Are there any changes desired?

Commissioner Kathy Mitchell: No changes.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. The first order of business we'll have public comments. This is a time on the agenda for an opportunity for anyone to speak to the Planning Commission about

any topic except the subjects the public hearing that is to be held tonight. So would anybody like to speak on any other subject? You'll be limited to three minutes.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Hearing none...okay. So we will now turn to the public hearing. The purpose of this 2018 Docket public hearing is to receive testimony and written correspondence regarding this year's proposals to amend the Comprehensive Plan, the Land Use and Zoning Map, and the Development Code. The order of the public hearings, if we can get the sign-up sheets in the proper order – it might not work – is: number 1, a County-initiated proposal to amend the comprehensive Plan in order to incorporate levels of service and projected needs at the drainage districts.

Number 2 will be the County-initiated proposals to amend provisions in the Development Code.

Three will be a County-initiated proposal to amend the zoning of approximately 37 parcels in the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest.

Fourth will be a citizen-initiated proposal to permit existing camps in the Rural Intermediate zone.

Number 5, a citizen-initiated proposal to permit restaurants in the Agricultural-Natural Resource Land zone.

And finally, 6 will be a County-initiated proposal to amend the zoning of approximately 4,000 acres on South Fidalgo Island to a new zone, which would be the South Fidalgo Rural Residential.

So we have separate sign-up sheets for each of these proposals, hopefully in the proper order. If you wish to speak and you're on the sign-up list, you're asked to limit your time to three minutes. And there's going to be a lot of people – last year we had over 60 – and we have to vacate the building after a certain amount of time. In order to give everybody the opportunity to speak, we'd like everybody to please strictly adhere to that three minute rule. When the timer goes off, you're asked to relinquish the podium and allow the next speaker to take your place. In order to expedite this, I will call out the first name on the list followed by the second, and ask the first person to take the podium and the second person to be ready underneath the TV screen, or in that area, so that there's minimal time spent shuffling in and out of the seating area. Okay?

Before you testify, clearly state your name, spelling your last name, and your address. A recording system will record your comments. Written comments are also being accepted and can be placed in the box located on the staff table near the front of the room, which is over here. The written comment period on each proposal is open until Friday, August 31<sup>st</sup>, at 4:30 p.m. Written comments are not limited in length or on the number of issues that you may raise.

So before we begin, the staff will give a brief presentation. And one last exhortation is these microphones are very sensitive so I've been asked to warn everybody not to touch the microphone. Thank you. Stacie?

Stacie Pratschner: All right. Good evening, Planning Commissioners. Good evening to administration and staff who are here this evening, also to members of the community that are in attendance today. My name is Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner with the Planning and Development Services Department. Thank you for having me here today.

This is the public hearing to accept testimony on the Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Map, and Development Code text amendments that are all a part of the 2018 docket. The Department's presentation this evening prior to the public comment portion of the hearing will include the regulatory background for the docket; a description of the proposed amendments; it will address the public comment period and also provide the Department's recommendations for the Planning Commission's consideration in advance of deliberations.

Under the Growth Management Act the County may adopt a package of changes to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations once per year through the docketing process. The purpose of docketing is to ascertain the cumulative effect of various proposals on the community. Annual amendments included in the docket are meant to address both citizen- and County-initiated changes – amendments to the text of the Comprehensive Plan, amendments to the Development Code, and also the Land Use/Zoning Map.

Prior to this public hearing this evening the Department has held two public hearings and deliberations with the Board of County Commissioners to determine which of this year's proposals merited inclusion on this year's docket. The docket was then set by the Board of County Commissioners via resolution earlier this year and the result are the proposals and recommendations that are the subject of this evening's hearing.

The staff report provided in advance of this evening's hearing provides findings of fact concerning the Department's compliance with both state and local regulations for SEPA review and public noticing. Within the staff report each of the proposed policy text and map amendments have been analyzed against applicable criteria in the Development Code, and options for the Planning Commission's consideration have been included.

Items C-1 through C-18 include County-initiated text amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Code. Item C-1 is a proposal to modify Comprehensive Plan Policy 4A-5.6. The purpose of the policy is to encourage better collaboration between the drainage districts and the County by requiring the County to incorporate those district capacities into our annual capital facilities updates. With the exception of the text amendments that the Department recommends addressing through the long range work program instead of the docket, the Department recommends that the Planning Commission consider recommending adoption of the proposed amendments to the Board of County Commissioners. As of this afternoon, the Department is not in receipt of any written comments about docket items C-1 through C-18.

Item C-19 is a County proposal to modify the zoning of approximately 2800 acres in and adjacent to the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest from the existing public Open Space of Regional Statewide Importance zoning to the Industrial Forest-Natural Resources Lands designation. The Development Code states that the purpose of the public open space zoning – OSRSI is the acronym for it – is to provide a designation for lands that are in *public* ownership and then dedicate those lands to public purposes such as recreation or scenic amenities.

The 37 parcels identified, however, and that you can see on the map, are in *private* ownership so the purpose of this amendment is to designate those lands with an appropriate zoning that allows private use and enjoyment of those properties. The Department recommends that the Planning Commission consider recommending adoption of the proposed map amendment to the Board of County Commissioners. This is listed as Option 3 in the staff report. As of this afternoon, the Department is in receipt of a comment of support about docket item C-19.

Item PL17-0414 is a proposal submitted by Quaker Cove Ministries to permit existing camps in the Rural Intermediate zone. Now this petition originally came in as a request for a land use map amendment. The applicants then requested to withdraw that petition for a zoning change and instead consider a code amendment to the existing Rural Intermediate zone that will allow improvements to be made at the camp while also acknowledging that there are two other developed and existing camps in the Rural Intermediate zone, both Camp Kirby and Samish Island Campground. The Department recommends that the Planning Commission consider recommending adoption of the proposed code amendment to the Board of County Commissioners. This is listed as Option 3 in the staff report. As of this afternoon, the Department is in receipt of a number of written comments of support concerning docket item PL17-0414.

Item P-2 is a proposal submitted by Samish Bay Cheese to define “limited food service” – in this case, small restaurants – as an agricultural accessory use. The Skagit County Agricultural Advisory Board has recommended not adopting any changes to code, citing concerns about the loss of productive farmland and an existing lack of enforcement for ongoing, unpermitted activities in the agriculture zone. Pursuant to the findings from the Ag Advisory Board and the agricultural resource lands guiding principles in the Comprehensive Plan, the Department recommends that the Planning Commission consider recommending no action on the proposed amendment to the Board of County Commissioners. This is listed as Option 1 in your staff report. As of this afternoon the Department is not in receipt of any written comments about docket item P-2.

The Ag Advisory Board – I’ll go ahead and put this on the projector; there we go – the Ag Advisory Board did request that I make a clarification to their letter. As you can see, they have submitted a comment regarding item PL17-0414. That should say “PL17-0416.” This was the request before the docket was set by resolution for an amendment to permit fully contained communities within Skagit County. So I just wanted to make that clarification per the Ag Advisory Board’s recommendation.

Item P-12 was originally a citizen-initiated proposal submitted by residents of South Fidalgo Island in 2015 to amend the zoning designation of approximately 4,000 acres on the island from the Rural Reserve designation to a new zone that would limit a number of special uses, Hearing Examiner uses, and density bonuses. The amendment was processed as part of the 2017 docket. Last year the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to not adopt these changes.

The Board of County Commissioners, via ordinance, deferred – and there’s a copy of the ordinance there – deferred P-12 to the 2018 docket and the Board directed the Planning Department to place P-12 on the 2018 docket in order to conduct further analysis and public review of the proposal, specifically how the proposal would impact existing businesses and agriculture in the proposed rezone area. Pursuant to this ordinance, the Department modified the extent of the rezone area so as not to impact existing businesses near Sharpe’s Corner, the golf course, or Pioneer Trails. The Department has also left the allowances for agriculture and agricultural accessory uses and processing so that they are the same as in the Rural Reserve zone. There had been discussion in 2017 about limiting the agricultural processing and products to products that were primarily produced on Fidalgo Island. That is not – that provision and that request is not included in this year’s code draft.

As of this afternoon, the Department is in receipt of a number of written comments both in opposition and in support of the proposed changes. Stated concerns about the proposal include but are not limited to the following: the lack of studies tying the proposed changes to the health of the island’s aquifers; the limitation on new housing if the density bonus is permitted through what

are called Conservation Reserve Development subdivisions – or CaRDs is the acronym for it – would now require public water. The potential limits on agriculture if the allowances for seasonal farmworker housing, outdoor storage of natural materials were removed. And then a concern that the proposal only considers the Rural Reserve zone but not the allowances or density in the Rural Intermediate zone on South Fidalgo Island.

Stated support of the proposal includes but is not limited to the limiting of a number of those special and Hearing Examiner uses in the new zone will lessen the probability of increased traffic and noise associated with commercial uses; that the rural character and lifestyles of the island are better maintained by limiting density and high impact uses; that the concern that increased development on the island, both commercial and residential, will lead to negative impacts on the aquifer; and then that the rezone represents an opportunity to address lot coverage constraints for major public uses.

With the consideration of the direction from the ordinance and the Board in 2017 and the implementation element of the Comprehensive Plan, the Department recommends that the Planning Commission consider recommending adoption of the new zone to the Board of County Commissioners. And this is listed as Option 4 in the staff report. The Department recommends that the Planning Commission consider keeping the allowances for CaRDs and CaRD density bonuses the same as it is now in the Rural Reserve zone, and also consider modifying the lot coverage limit for major public uses.

The Samish Indian Nation in their letter to the Commissioners requested that the lot coverage limit for all major public uses be lifted. The Planning Commission could consider a removal of the limitation, and removing this limitation would also apply to any expansion efforts by the Fidalgo Elementary School on the island, or consider modifying the lot coverage to a larger percentage or to a different square footage in order to accommodate the Samish Indian Nation's plans for a 30,000 square-foot cultural center on the island.

After this evening's hearing and testimony, the comment period will run until 4:30 p.m. on August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2018. The Planning Commission will hold deliberations most likely in early October to generate findings of fact for each proposal and then recommend a course of action to the Board of County Commissioners. The findings will then be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners and the Board will make a final decision to adopt, not adopt, or to defer each of the amendments.

This slide includes the comment information, both e-mail and written comments. I'll go ahead and leave that up.

Thank you so much, Commissioners. I tried to keep that blessedly brief. I'd be happy to answer any questions before we enter the public comment portion of the hearing.

Commissioner Tammy Candler: I have one question.

Ms. Pratschner: Yeah?

Commissioner Candler: The letter that you mentioned – this came in on C-19 – when do you think that will be up on the website?

Ms. Pratschner: Yeah, thank you. I spoke with our transcriptionist who puts together all the public comments. Typically public comments are available on the website approximately three days after

the end of the comment period. This means that we get every single written comment. It also allows for full transcription of this evening's hearing. Gives us time to do that so that can be posted as well as part of the public comment record. And if for some reason something gets e-mailed but we didn't catch it the first time, that gives us time to make sure we've got everything.

Commissioner Candler: Thank you.

Ms. Pratschner: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Are there any other questions?

Unidentified male voice in the audience: I have a question on –

Chair Raschko: Excuse me, sir. I'm asking if there are questions from the board. Thank you. Are there other questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Well, thanks, Stacie.

Ms. Pratschner: All right. Thank you, Commissioners.

Chair Raschko: With that, we'll begin the public testimony. I want to apologize in advance if I mispronounce anybody's name. Sometimes names can be difficult and some of the handwriting is hard to decipher, so please bear with me.

We'll first receive comments concerning docket item C-1 through C-18. Those are text amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Code. So first would be – I believe – Brandon Roozen, followed by Allen Roozen. Did I get that right?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And since there's only three, the final person would be Don McMoran.

Brandon Roozen: Good evening, members of the Planning Commission. Brandon Roozen, R-o-o-z-e-n. I'm the executive director at Western Washington Agricultural Association. Good evening.

We've been serving this community for about 70 years and working on behalf of the farm community to make sure that they are viable and preserved on this landscape. As such, over the past couple decades we've also had special relationships and contracts with the Skagit County special purpose districts – dike, drainage, and irrigation. There's 12 of them serving this community.

I would like to voice our support for the recommendation to the Commission and to the Commissioners to work with the drainage districts – and between the Department – to look at and review plans and processes to accept additional drainage water and/or facilities that impact the drainage facilities. So I just wanted to express that really quickly. If you have any questions, I'd be glad to answer them, but I think it's just important for us to make sure all folks understand that we are already working with the Planning Department and we've had communications with them. I've incorporated leadership from the dike drainage and irrigation districts to ensure that they are involved in this process, and we look forward to continuing this work with them. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. So is Allen Roozen – or Rozema – in the room?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And that would be followed by Don McMoran please.

Allen Rozema: Good evening, Commissioners. Allen Rozema, A-I-I-e-n R-o-z-e-m-a. I'm the executive director of Skagitonians to Preserve Farmland. We're also in support of this proposed policy change, having worked with the Planning Department. And we play a supporting role to Western Washington Ag districts as well in supporting issues around drainage infrastructure and all the things necessary to support agriculture. So we like this language – very strong. It supports collaboration, which we can hopefully all support, so thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. So Don McMoran?

Don McMoran: Good evening, Commissioners. Don McMoran. That's D-o-n M-c-capital M-o-r-a-n. I reside at 14573 Beaver Marsh Road, Mount Vernon, Washington. Many of you might know me from my work with Washington State University as your local Extension faculty here in Skagit County. Tonight I come wearing a different hat, and that's the hat of a farm son as well as hopefully raising some farm daughters in the future here. And I'd just like to make mention to the Commissioners that you're thinking about the next generation in the decisions that you're making tonight. When I think about many of the issues that are before you I think about that next generation and making it more difficult to farm rather than easier. So I just ask for you to take that under consideration when you're making your decisions tonight and moving forward. So thank you for your time.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. So that is the end of comments concerning C-1 through C-18. And we'll next move to comments concerning docket item PL17-0414, the Quaker Cove request to permit existing campgrounds in the Rural Intermediate zone. So first would be Ellen Bynum, followed by Jay Lewis. And I'd ask Mr. Lewis to kindly approach in order to facilitate things. Thanks.

Ellen Bynum: Good evening, Commissioners. Ellen Bynum. I'm executive director of Friends of Skagit County, 110 North First, Mount Vernon.

The proposal that was originally presented to the Planning Department to do a total rethink of the zoning to an SRT, which is Small-Scale Recreation and Tourism, would put the function of that camp into a LAMIRD. And as I read the rulings about LAMIRDs, they're generally for commercial and industrial businesses. They don't always have to be. But in the SRT, new residential development is not permitted. So I don't think that request would accomplish what the people are trying to accomplish. I went back and looked at also the terms of uses and the terms of uses would be for four months a year, so I don't know what their ideas are about that. They have withdrawn the SRT application, but I want to go back to the *Evergreen Islands, et al. v. Skagit County*, the Growth Management Hearings Board number 22-2-0046c, because it also deals with the requirement that the County complete a subarea plan and this camp is within a subarea planning area, though the South Fidalgo plan has never been completed. There was a draft plan done. There were meetings done. I participated in some of those meetings. But that requirement of that particular ruling, in my understanding, still stands. So the County is – needs to complete an approved subarea plan and in that planning process deal with what Quaker Cove is going to do.



I'm going to say similar things about the Fidalgo area subarea plan for P-12, but I wanted to bring this up because one of the problems in looking at this operation is that it is historically – fits in historically. It's been operated by a church for many years, since 1930. That's okay. That's wonderful. But the operation was limited to summer activities generally and the facilities don't have any permitting. There's no record of any septic permits at the camp. That needs to be revised and taken care of, especially if you're thinking of allowing 250 people there at a time. So I would like to recommend that you revisit that and if you do decide to approve what they're asking for in a rezone that you set a maximum number of uses that's closer to historical attendance, and setting both hours of operation and days of operation per year to reflect the original intended use of the property.

(sound of timer)

Chair Raschko: Well done. Thank you. It was Mr. Lewis and followed by Art Fournier – or Fornier.

Jay Lewis: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Jay Lewis, L-e-w-i-s. I live at 15178 Gibraltar Road, just a short walk down the road from Quaker Cove.

I'm here in support of the proposal that would add the pre-existing camps as an allowed administrative use in Rural Intermediate zone in Skagit County. This basically would allow Quaker Cove to be able to use the land for its original purpose, which was a camp since it was originally purchased in 1930. Basically there's a need for infrastructure change at Quaker Cove. My wife and I are co-directors of a camp that has been at Quaker Cove for the last three years. The first year we had 23 middle school kids, the second year we had about 30, and this past year we had 50. So it's been a very popular camp and my wife and I have been co-directors of that camp.

There is some need of some basic infrastructure changes at Quaker Cove. And we are not only in support of this proposal but we have been volunteering there for some time. And thank you for this opportunity.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Next would be Art Fournier – I hope I got the name right – followed by Carl or Liz – the last name is spelled S-e-u-m-e. I'm not brave enough to try to pronounce that.

Art Fournier: My name is Art Fournier. My address is 14785 Gibraltar Road. I'm speaking for 35 homeowners on my neighborhood and I'm speaking about the Quaker Cove retreat. I live adjacent to the Quaker Cove for 30 years. I've been friends with the Quakers for years. Okay. What was going on July 1<sup>st</sup>, 1990 and before?

The use: Quaker Cove Church family retreat twice or three times a year until 2010, around 50 occupants.

Buildings: eight family cabins for multipurpose chapel and dining.

Condition: abandoned in disrepair from 1970 to the year 2005.

Land use designation: The Quakers encapsulated their 1930 dedication in the original sign that read "Quaker Cove Retreat," "retreat" meaning church or meeting place.

Change of land use designation: Early in 2017, the new Quaker Cove directors and agent for the Anacortes Christian Church advertised their new practices by installing a new sign that reads

“Quaker Cove Camps and Retreats,” meaning highly intensive business use and commercial venture.

Rezone: In July 2017, the new Quaker Cove directors apply for an SRT, Small Recreation and Tourist rezone. In December of 2017, the Gibraltar Road neighborhood notified the County Commissioners opposing the rezone and listing the Quaker Cove activities beyond their nonconforming use. Around April 2018, the County notifies some neighbors that the Anacortes Christian Church or Quaker Cove had withdrawn their application in favor of a code amendment. During the year of 2017 and the last two months of 2018, the Quaker Cove has demonstrated how disruptive and incompatible the new activities can be to the peace and tranquility of the neighborhood. The non-permitted change in the land use designation of the property and its abandon is highly questionable. On page 2 of the SEPA checklist, the applicants state: “We, the Quaker Cove, believe that the property was overlooked and should have been recognized as a camp when originally when the original zoning took place,” meaning it’s not a camp.

For all the above reasons, the neighborhood is requesting the study and verification of the above issues –

(sound of timer)

Mr. Fournier: – and the new Quaker Cove operation environmental impacts on the neighborhood including –

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Mr. Fournier: – business \_\_\_\_ frequency and noise.

Chair Raschko: Sir, your time is up. Thank you.

Mr. Fournier: Yeah, thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, next would be – now, Karl and Liz Seume, were you intended to sign on together? You’re going to speak separately? That’s fine.

Karl Seume: Yeah, my name’s Karl Seume, K-a-r-l S-e-u-m-e, and at 14694 Gibraltar Road. My wife and I are directors at Quaker Cove retreat.

The camp was started in 1930 when several Quaker churches purchased the land in Anacortes and began building cabins and common use buildings such as a dining hall, chapel, and bath house. They purchased the land to be able to bring families and people together in nature to experience peace and renewal and come closer to God. Three years ago my wife and I, along with our three small children, moved to Quaker Cove Retreat in Anacortes to become the first fulltime onsite directors of the camp. In our time at the camp, it has been so great to interact with the community and build up new programs which benefit kids and families in Anacortes. We’ve been offering culinary classes, middle school camp, day camp, and several events where families can interact with each other, like our winter gingerbread housebuilding event. One of our most exciting and newer programs is our day camp for grade school kids.

During our five-day day camp program kids spend six-and-a-half hours outside each day playing and learning, interacting with their peers and with adults who care about them. Statistics say that the average child spends only four minutes a day playing outside. Kids practice being adventurous

and courageous. They build friendships and are shown that they are important and loved, and all of this without cell phones, computers, or TV.

Since we started this program three years ago the number of kids has doubled each year, and this year we had 85 kids participate over two weeks. Kids need to be outside and interacting with nature. This is important for their growth and development and is just one reason why camps like ours are so important to the community.

We approached the County a year-and-a-half ago to try to replace an old building with a newer building which had bathrooms but was 12 feet longer. We were told that we were not allowed to change the footprint of any buildings or add any new buildings to our property because camps were no longer allowed in the zoning. The County then told us that applying to rezone our land was the only option to be able to make changes so we applied to rezone. In April the County approached us again to say they had come up with a different option: to add pre-existing camps into Rural Intermediate zoning. We were glad for this option and withdrew our original application as we believed this would be better for us and for our neighbors.

Please approve the addition of pre-existing camps to Rural Intermediate zoning so that our camp and camps like ours are able to have a venue to make necessary changes to our facilities. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Next then – finally, next would be Shannon Redmond.

Commissioner Mitchell: Oh, and Liz first.

Chair Raschko: I know – on deck.

Liz Seume: Should I start?

Chair Raschko: Go ahead.

Ms. Seume: My name is Liz Seume. The last name is S-e-u-m-e, and we're at 14694 Gibraltar Road, Anacortes. We live at the camp.

So my husband and I are the current directors at Quaker Cove Retreat. I also grew up and have been attending camps there since the early '80s and I would say that the camp has fully been in use, and perhaps not recognized by our neighbors as fully in use but it has been. I have records and historical documents to show that we have used the camp throughout the year since it began in 1930.

In order for our camp to survive and in order for us to be a safe and accessible as possible for those attending our camps, we need to be able to modernize some buildings, which means expanding them to add bathrooms or appropriate seating or building ADA-accessible housing and moving some facilities in our camp, like keeping maintenance away from where campers are. Adding pre-existing camps into the current Rural Intermediate zoning will allow us for a special use permit to be able to make those changes. Our camp was around before zoning and we do believe it was overlooked in the zoning code. It should have been recognized as a camp and included in that zoning or included in a different type of zoning. So we do believe we were overlooked, which doesn't mean that we weren't a camp. It just means that we were overlooked.

I would like to set the record straight. Our neighbor who spoke previously who was upset to learn about our application to rezone wrote a petition against us with a list of very slanderous accusations about our camp, and that was submitted during an additional hearing that we didn't know was going to address our application to rezone so we weren't there. He went from home to home on our street telling people that we were planning to build a racetrack and a marina and change the use of our property with a large sum of money that had been given to the camp, and also that we were under the control of Anacortes Christian Church, which is not true. My husband and I both grew up Quaker and we *attend* Anacortes Christian Church. So mystery solved.

Changing the use and character of our camp has never been our intention and no one has given us any large amounts of money – although we are taking donations if anyone's interested!

(laughter)

Ms. Seume: We certainly have no plans to build a racetrack or a marina. I'm submitting letters from three neighbors whose land borders our land. They are in support of our camp and have also refuted the ridiculous claims made in the earlier petition against us. In their letter, one neighbor says "We were shocked and saddened to learn of this petition and the false claims it purported. We have never once been negatively impacted by anyone using the Quaker Cove Retreat and the activities occurring there." The majority of our neighbors also fully support Quaker Cove and the current improvement efforts.

Another neighbor who had signed the petition against us has submitted a letter to the County already in support of us and withdrawing their support from that petition, and admitting that they signed the petition in fear of what might be and not really what is. They also stated that they, quote, "have not seen any undesirable behavior from any event or person arriving at, staying at, or departing Quaker Cove." End quote.

We believe that the positive testimony from our other direct neighbor shows clearly –

(sound of timer)

Ms. Seume: – that these statements made were not true. If any question remains, we would be more than happy to submit our usage numbers and financial documents –

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Seume: – which clearly show the camp is not being used in a capacity –

Chair Raschko: Okay, Shannon Redmond, please.

Ms. Seume: – that could be considered excessive.

Shannon Redmond: Hello. I'm Shannon Redmond, S-h-a-n-n-o-n R-e-d-m-o-n-d. My address is 7381 Lone Buck Drive, Anacortes, Washington. My husband and I fully support the proposal to add pre-existing camps to the current Rural Intermediate zoning. My name is Shannon Redmond and I'm a bordering neighbor of the Quaker Cove property. My husband and I have known Liz and Karl for about two-and-a-half years now. When we moved in the camp looked a little rough for not being taken care of for the last 20 years or so. The previous caretakers just lacked the ambition, motivation, and love that Liz and Karl have for the camp. Since we have moved in the camp has been fixed up to the best of their ability and within the limits of the current zoning

policies. The camp is now clean, fun, and full of love, but there's still a lot of improvements that need to be made to move the camp forward and to make it a better place for the guests.

My husband and I have read over the petition that was passed around the neighborhood a few months back. First, I am surprised that people have signed something they obviously did not research, read, or ask the camp about. Second, it is obvious that some of the things on the list of the petition are made up or just petty. Number seven on the list, "Yelling for three shifts a day." That yelling is the sound of kids playing, making friends, learning, and having fun, not an organized yelling session to annoy the neighbors.

Number 5 on the list, "High occupancy." It's a camp. Of course there's going to be extra people in the camp during the summer; however, I share a driveway with the camp and I have never had an issue with too many cars or people on the road.

Number 12 on the list, "Band practice." I have never heard a band practicing; however, I have heard the guests worshipping through song and prayer, which disproves number 11 on the list – that most guests have no regard for the property's dedication to worship through song and prayer.

Number 4, "Driving in and out of the fields even though there is a tunnel." This tunnel is meant to be walked through, not driven through, and it is easier to move supplies, furniture, et cetera, via vehicles. Can you imagine trying to move a piano through a tunnel in a field when they could just back up to the building?

Number 13 on the list: The camp is most definitely not a motel/bed and breakfast and the mess hall is most definitely not a restaurant. If it was, I would have the worst service ever because I have been waiting over two years to be served.

I think I have made my point. Liz and Karl are better neighbors than I could have asked for. Their kids are loving, kind, and smart, and there is not one bad bone in this family's body. The camp would not be the great fun and safe place it is today for kids to come visit and have a great time at camp if it wasn't for them. The camp would either rot away into nothing or possibly have been sold to some subdivision. I can't speak for my neighbors, but I for one do not want that to happen. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. So that will conclude comments concerning docket item PL17-0414. And we'll turn to comments concerning docket item P-2, Samish Bay Cheese request to permit restaurants as an agricultural accessory use. First is Allen Rozema, and he will be followed by – did we already do this? – Brandon Rozema (sic).

(several Commissioners speaking at the same time)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Commissioner Mitchell: They might be on a new one.

Chair Raschko: They are. All right.

Mr. Rozema: Good evening again, Commissioners. We are – want to get – again, we provided comment during the docketing process. Skagitonians to Preserve Farmland is in support of Option 3 and we would encourage – like to encourage the Planning Commission to also consider and evaluate Option 3. Option 3, just to refresh, is we're not supporting the current proposal at this time but we do see a need to enter into long range planning. Agritourism is burgeoning in Skagit

County. We all have seen wedding venues come online. There's more and more larger-scale farmstands – things like that – homestays, farmstays, Airbnbs. So we think it's time to begin a study of the process, and where the study leads us, of course, SPF would like to follow along, participate, and support, and then hopefully come to a more comprehensive look and maybe solutions moving forward. But the piecemeal approach that we have been taking – looking at one specific issue at a time one year at a time – doesn't appear to be working and we would encourage the Planning Department and the Planning Commission to look at doing a more comprehensive look at the breadth and depth of agritourism in Skagit County and maybe come with a suite of recommendations. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Next would be Brandon Roozen, followed by Roger Webster (sic).

Mr. Roozen: Brandon Roozen, R-o-o-z-e-n, Western Washington Agricultural Association executive director. Good to see you again! I would like to voice Western Washington Agricultural Association's support for the current position recommended; however, I would like to also articulate one point. That is, that we have, whether we know it or not, agricultural tourism – agritourism – that is alive and well within Skagit County, whether we know what it is or not. Whether it's – again, as Mr. Rozema pointed out – wedding venues or hunting or any number of other things that occur on these lands, we do believe there is a discussion that is needed to more comprehensively address all of these uses to make sure that these lands and the production that occurs on these lands is maintained for future generations. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Roger Webster, followed by Terry Sapp.

Roger Wechsler: Roger *Wechsler*, R-o-g-e-r W-e-c-h-s-l-e-r, representing Samish Bay Cheese at 15115 Bow Hill Road.

After about 18 years primarily selling at farmers' markets, from our dairy we're trying to do more on the farm, and we are going down a path toward more agritourism. We have tourist signs on I-5 now. We're getting more people to come to the farm, and what we want to do in terms of food service is very limited. We don't want to run a restaurant. We have a farm store to sell our product and we want to be able to have limited food service so we can sell cheese boards, introduce people to our product, and get people to come to the farm and help us sell more of what we produce from our own milk, from our own dairy products, from our own beef that we raise and have slaughtered on the farm.

The change to the code that I proposed is very limited and restricted, and the way the definition for "agriculture accessory use" is now, number 7, is, in my opinion, allows limited food service as a – activities associated with tourism which promote local agriculture. Well, that's what we want to do and we want to be able to do more of it. I don't see any serious negative impact to the agricultural community and I think it will be an enhancement of opportunities for growers small and large. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Terry Sapp.

Terry Sapp: Yes, I am Terry Sapp, T-e-r-r-y S-a-p-p, and my address is 584 Walla Walla Way, La Conner. I'm a third generation now-farmer – not always through my career a farmer but a third generation now-farmer. I farm in Sedro-Woolley.

I am *very* interested and concerned about the preservation of farmland in the Skagit County, in particular the small acreage parcels. Too few of them are remaining. Too many of them are

subject to alternate use and development in many ways. I speak in favor of the third option presented by the staff to the Commission and the Commissioners – County Commissioners – wherein further study would be observed and pursued regarding the broader range of agritourism in this county. And being statements have been made about that already that I wouldn't need to repeat, but I want to bring out one more item not said about the future of non-agricultural activities on ag land in the ag zones. And that is about enforcement. I've seen – I think many of us know – that may be presumptuous – that permitted activities have a natural way of expanding beyond the permitted limits. Wedding venues become concert venues become sites for other kinds of activities. A venue that is permitted for 11 events or 12 events per year seeks 14 or 16 in order to – for good reasons. Sometimes simply to be more economic. None of us would argue against that. But the notion of creep – if you'll allow a term – for extending a little bit more and a little bit more the number of guests or the number of seats or the number of activities or the kind of activities that the County cannot easily control because it does not have an enforcement mechanism. So it just happens. And then over time parties argue that we've always been doing this, or it's necessary to do this, or a little bit more would be a little more better, in whatever terms it might be – often economical. And it's true. Enforcement, control, setting real limits and living by them is a big issue out there in the ag zone. Thank you very much.

(sound of timer)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. That will conclude comments concerning docket item P-2. We'll now take comments concerning docket item P-12, the South Fidalgo Rural Residential land use map amendment. First would be Vincent Henley, followed by Pam Doddridge.

Vincent Henley: Good evening, Commissioners, members of staff, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Vincent Henley. I live at 4306 Shelby Court in Anacortes. In a previous life I did have a few things to do with planning and zoning matters; hence my interest in this particular activity. A long time ago when I was a much younger engineer than I am now, I was given a maxim. And the maxim is: If it ain't broke, don't fix it. And so as I look at this proposal, which is a massive proposal – you're removing, for example – rough count – approximately 21 current uses, special uses, from the zone and removing them from the new zone. That's a pretty large change. I've tried to avail myself of all of the information that's available publicly for this particular item and I must confess that I can't see what particular problem it's trying to solve. As near as I can tell, this is a solution in search of a problem. I would strongly recommend that the Commissioners recommend Option 1. In other words, do nothing. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Pam Doddridge, to be followed by Tom Conroy.

Pam Doddridge: I'm Pam Doddridge, D-o-d-d-r-i-d-g-e. I live at 13562 Islewood Drive in Anacortes. I'm here today to voice my strong opposition to P-12. I fail to see any evidence put forth that the current zoning is not working or that it needs to be changed. I would ask the Commissioners choose Option 1, the no action alternative. P-12 takes away property rights of a small group of property owners in the name of preserving the rural character. At the same time, the items they want to limit strip property owners of traditional rural uses. Some of the reasons myself and others moved to live outside of the city limits were to enjoy the things that living on land allows us to do. Taking away these rights and doing so in the name of a solution in search of a problem is capricious and punitive.

We are unsure why the County has continued to pursue this proposal. Last year we found out about the proposed changes and wrote letters, saw the result being that the Planning Commission said no by a margin of seven to two, and we thought this was over. One of the things that struck me when I read the staff's proposal of P-12 for this year's docket is the inclusion of protecting the aquifer. This is a change from the previous wording without any studies being performed to verify that there is a need to protect the aquifer. My property currently uses well water. Currently most of the residents of Fidalgo Island use the City of Anacortes water, which comes out of the Skagit River. There is no mention in the staff report that those on City water are actually adding to the aquifer. The report also states that the community wants this. I live in the community and I don't want it. I know the Commissioners have looked at the map and I wonder if they, like myself, have wondered, Why is it a patchwork? There is no continuity to the boundaries and they seem a bit arbitrary. It seems to me that another effort at spot zoning for the convenience of a few.

There appears to be a group that have decided that they are the only stewards of Fidalgo Island and they know best. They fight every permit that goes to the County and this change would mean that they would not have to keep their diligent watch on what their neighbors might or might (not) be doing with their own property.

Some of the ways that I foresee that this proposal affects me and how I currently use my land relates to agriculture production. We own a blueberry farm in Skagit Valley and part of the reason I purchased it was to incorporate it within what I already do on my property on Fidalgo Island. I intend to sell eggs and produce grown on both my Fidalgo property and, when in season, the blueberries from my small farm.

The idea of banning kennels bothers me. I would like to raise and show dogs, and at the same time, what about what's wrong with an animal clinic? I think it would be great to have one really close. And I'm pretty sure animals are something most people think about when they think of a rural area. Banning them seems crazy.

ATVs. In the staff report, it mentions that the new zoning is not for getting rid of an individual's right to ride their ATVs on their property. But honestly, it's very vaguely written. It says I and my family can use ATVs on the property. Does that mean (if) I have friends staying they cannot?

Removing the CaRD density bonus except where water is from the public water source. Again I ask: Where are the studies showing that there is a water problem on Fidalgo Island? When limited to one house per 10 acres, the CaRD can actually help in planning for retirement, allowing a parent to stay in their own home with a family member close by. The Planning Department wants the same –

(sound of timer)

Ms. Doddridge: – approach – all right. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.  
(applause)

Chair Raschko: Tom Conroy, and next would be Gary Hagland.

Tom Conroy: Hi, I'm Thomas Conroy and a resident – C-o-n-r-o-y – a resident of South Fidalgo and homeowner for the past 40 years. My address is 4307 Ginnett Road. I'm here today to support



the 2018 docket item P-12, the South Fidalgo Island Rural Residential map amendment to the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan.

First I want to thank the Planning Commissioners and the Planning Department for the time and considerations given in the preparation of the proposed amendment. The creation of the South Fidalgo Rural Residential zone acknowledges that a new zoning designation is needed to properly address the problematic realities that are unique to islands. The amendment to the County's Comprehensive Plan is in accord and reflects the intent of the Washington State Growth Management Act. This proposal's removal of some commercial and industrial uses from South Fidalgo Island's Rural Residential zone is consistent with the sentiments of a clear majority of South Fidalgo residents, as witnessed by the results of a survey mailed out to *all* South Fidalgo residents in 2006. This survey specifically asked residents if they were in favor of maintaining South Fidalgo's rural characteristics or did they prefer to rezone all of South Fidalgo to allow parcels as small as 2.5-acre parcels. 90% of islanders preferred that zoning remain unchanged – actually more than that. P-12, contrary to what some people have maintained, does not change home-based businesses or existing businesses. The proposal's measure to remove several commercial uses from the zone is more of a housecleaning measure than a violation of property rights.

Planning Commissioners – let me see – Planning Commissioners and staffers work hard to protect and better delineate the activities permitted and disallowed throughout Skagit County on a daily basis. This is a *planning* process and not an attempt to rob citizens of their property rights. Their hard work allows all of us to purchase a house in a neighborhood of our own choosing and know with some certainty that the basic characteristics of that neighborhood will remain more or less constant. The property rights movement has more to do with ideology than the process of planning.

I support a Samish cultural center, but requests for a rezone that would allow – I would support the Samish cultural center, but the request for a rezone that would allow unlimited square footage for building seems ill advised and better handled under a special use permit where the entire project can be reviewed and proper limitations set. Thank you.

(sound of timer)

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Gary Hagland, and next would be Tom Wooten.

Gary Hagland: My name is Gary Hagland, H-a-g-l-a-n-d. I live in Anacortes at 2211 37<sup>th</sup> Court. Tonight I am speaking as a representative of the Skagit chapter of the Citizens Alliance for Property Rights.

We oppose a rezoning as outlined in proposed item P-12 and urge the Planning Commission and subsequently the Board of County Commissioners to select Option 1: Do nothing. P-12 is unfair, unnecessary, and according to the August 15<sup>th</sup> *Anacortes American*, based on its feedback, it appears opposed overwhelmingly by the residents of the areas affected on South Fidalgo Island. P-12 would create an entirely new land use category, Rural Residential, with restrictions not applied to other and sometimes adjacent properties. Why should homeowners who find themselves living in these newly designated zones be subject to these requirements and prevented from uses of their land while their neighbors are not? Some of the activities and uses that would not be permitted under this proposal would not happen anyway because it makes no

economic sense. Others now require special use permits and would have to go through an extensive process including public commenting and Hearing Examiner review.

Probably the cruelest proposal in P-12 is that it would prevent property owners from a minor subdivision of their land unless piped water was available. Many rural Skagit families are close-knit and want their grown children to be able to build nearby. Extending water lines is very costly and would deter all but the wealthy from following through with their plans. In addition, although proponents of the measure claim that the water is drawn from a sole source aquifer and is threatened by further development, no study has been conducted. One of the more puzzling aspects of the effort to change the zoning is that many, if not most, of those who favor the rezoning either do not live in the delineated zones or they would not be affected by the new restrictions; however, these people want to dictate how others will live. There's something very wrong with this picture.

Based on the above and last year's Planning Commission's deliberations and vote, we believe the Commissioners should refuse to accept P-12 as an unwanted and unnecessary infringement of South Fidalgo residents' property rights by choosing Option 1.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Tom Wooten, followed by Bob Eberle.

Tom Wooten: All right, good evening. Commissioners, my name is Tom Wooten, T-o-m-W-o-o-t-e-n. I live at 2300 33<sup>rd</sup> Street in Anacortes, Washington. I'm also the chairman of the Samish Indian Nation and I'm excited about being here.

The tribe has been planning a cultural/ spiritual center for quite some time and we kind of got caught up in the lot coverage change that happened. Our facility that we're looking at, as our written testimony says, it's about 30,000 square feet. Needless to say, that's larger than what is currently allowed under the current zoning. This is an opportunity for us to bring our project forward. Regardless, you know, we want to make this happen. The plan is for the cultural community center/spiritual center to be on City of Anacortes water, which runs right by our property on Campbell Lake. We're in support of the change currently. Regardless, we're going to move forward if the Commissioners decide to not do anything, as many of the folks here have said, we're going to continue through the process anyway to seek our community center being built. But since we have this opportunity to address folks here – our neighbors and the Commission – I thought I'd come out today and let you all know that we're in support of the changes as they currently are presented and look forward to the outcome, whatever that is, and we support the change. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Is Bob Eberle here?

(applause)

Bob Eberle: I'm going to yield my time.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. That would bring up Steve Verbarendse. After Steve will be Tom Glade.

Steve Verbarendse: Good evening. My name's Steve Verbarendse, 6192 Campbell Lake Road, V-e-r-b-a-r-e-n-d-s-e. I oppose P-12 and urge the Planning Commission as well as the County Commissioners to vote Option 1 with no changes.

During this entire process I've never heard the reasoning, clear reasoning why this was necessary. My family and I have lived on our property for 20-plus years. One of the things that really got my attention was the possibility for aviation being disallowed. I operate a floatplane off the lake on Lake Campbell, keep it at my residence. You know, I've had aircraft there our entire time so it's something near and dear to me and my family. Lake Campbell has a long history of having floatplanes on it. When I was a young man, that's what urged me to build there.

Off-road vehicles is another one. Our kids have rode motorcycles on the property. I was raised that way. Friends come over, you know, race around the property. We've got 6.2 acres. Many of the property owners there have, I mean, up to a hundred acres. There's a big difference, you know, with this zoning that disallows a smaller parcel for, I guess, depending on the definition – they say “racetracks” or “off-road use areas,” they say they can use it for their own use, but what if friends come over? I mean, I was raised on 60 acres and our friends came over all the time. We rode, had a great time. It's where a lot of my mechanical ability was founded was bikes. So I don't understand that.

Wholesale greenhouses. It's something my daughter looked at doing actually when she was younger. Wanted to raise flower baskets and sell them. Looked at all the flower baskets in downtown Anacortes and thought, Wow, I could put those together. That'd be great. And that would be disallowed with P-12.

So a lot of other reasons. There hasn't been a lot of time to respond to this. You know, we found out about it late. A lot of our neighbors/friends weren't aware of this issue, so we're kind of fighting from behind here a little bit. So thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Tom Glade, and after Mr. Glade will be Bill Doddridge.

Tom Glade: Good evening, my name is Tom Glade. I reside at 210 Mansfield Court in Anacortes. We own 10 acres of land in Rural Reserve and I'm here tonight speaking on behalf of Evergreen Islands.

Evergreen Islands has been in existence over 40 years. We got our start by stopping the nuclear power plant on Kiket Island. And so I'd like to show you some examples of these uses that are proposed in P-12 and I'd like you – if your neighbor was to execute one of these uses how you would address it, how your quality of life would change, how it would impact your property values, your financial, emotional, and spiritual values, and the impact on increased commercial and industrial traffic on the island, and the impact on the rural character of South Fidalgo Island. And then at the end just reflect on why you do live there. So and please note that anything that you don't see here, like banning floatplanes on Lake Campbell, aren't part of this package. Or limiting agricultural uses is not in this package.

How would you like if you had a pet emergency center on your – right next to your house or right across the street? How about a game reserve right across your house or right next to your house? Or campgrounds, like Pioneer Trails campground with, you know, all the traffic they get during the year? And the Fern Hill Cemetery: Would you like a cemetery next door to you or across the street from you? Or would you like a Butchart Gardens, which was actually attempted earlier in South Fidalgo's history? Or a fish hatchery? And you say, well, you know, Why would there be a fish hatchery? Well, coho salmon used to run up the stream into Lake Campbell, and so there *has*

been efforts to introduce coho into that stream. And how about another golf course somewhere in South Fidalgo next to your property? Or how about a kennel like Sunny Hills Kennels? Again, right next to your property, you know, with the noise and the barking and all that? Would you really like to have that next to your property? Or how about a manure lagoon with a sign around that says “Danger. Liquid manure storage”?

So I think these are reasonable exemptions for this island and I think you should think about, you know, why you live there and why, you know, you chose to live there. Or an off-road vehicle use area and trails? Not when your friends come over to ride on your property but, you know, where you can actually, you know, go every weekend and know that you can have a place to ride. Or outdoor storage of hazardous materials: Would this be an enhancement to your property and your property values –

(sound of timer)

Mr. Glade: – if you were to have this right next to you? Or a racetrack, a recreational racetrack?

Chair Raschko: Thank you. So Bill Doddridge.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: After Mr. Doddridge will be Mark Tibbles.

Bill Doddridge: I’m Bill Doddridge, D-o-d-d-r-i-d-g-e. I reside at – I have to look it up. I’m sorry – 13562 Islewood Drive, Anacortes.

I’m opposed to P-12, for Option 1. You seem to have quite a bit of fear-mongering going on here. This zone that we’ve had in place here has worked just fine. A lot of the – when he talks about toxic waste, it’s already in the current zoning. My understanding is it’s – hazardous waste is already not allowed. So that it just – I mean, what’s wrong with a doggie daycare center? I don’t have a problem with that. Even a cemetery. Wholesale of – you know, we have 35 acres. We have a lake. We’re on a lake. We have our own little biosphere. Whatever we do there no one would even know about. But we like to raise Bernese mountain dogs. We would like to do some wholesaling of nursery products. These would be prohibited. There’s already – to get any of these – the marketplace best regulates what goes in there. If there’s no support for it no one’s going to make a profit doing any of these things. And there’s plenty of conditional use permits and stuff. There’s plenty of ways to push back on any unreasonable use, and I’m for maintaining the current zoning, Option 1.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. And Mark Tibbles and after that will be Sherri Tibbles.

Mark Tibbles: All right, Commissioners, I’m Mark Tibbles, T-i-b-b-l-e-s. I have lived in South Fidalgo Island for over 50 years of my life. There have been a lot of changes, some of which I don’t care for. They affected my parents greatly when it got changed from being to sell off smaller parcels, which took care of part of their retirement. So, I mean, I’m sorry for the Samish Indian Nation on being changed for them too, but change happens.

One of the things, he had a picture up here just a minute ago about an anaerobic digester, and I was kind of curious about those, so I looked them up a few days ago and found it kind of interesting that our septic tanks are anaerobic digesters.

(laughter)

Mr. Tibbles: They're not just the big, ugly ones that are up here. There's also small uses of them where they use them for just household waste and produce methane gas to run their – heat their houses with – not big, ugly anaerobic digesters. They're not very clear on what you can have with that.

Another thing was that I know that when the wells got – you can't – any new wells in Skagit County out in the flats pretty much got cancelled. Something like 1600 parcels of land, their taxes got reduced because they got changed to recreational use. Well, does that mean our taxes will go down also because of the change in our land? The value of our land will be going down, so are our taxes going to go down and other people's are going to go up to compensate for that? That's just a couple things on it. Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. So Ms. Tibbles is passing so we'll ask for – yes, Stacie?

Ms. Pratschner: Pardon the interruption. The speaker has requested that I go up and put back up the slide that has the public comment information. May I before the next speaker? Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Sure. Thank you. So while she's doing that, the next person would be Judy Pepper, and after Ms. Pepper would be, I believe, Terry Dundsten (sic).

Ms. Pratschner: Thank you, Commissioners.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Judy Pepper: I'm Judy Pepper, J-u-d-y-P-e-p-p-e-r. We've lived in our acreage since 1965. When we bought it it was two-and-a-half acres \_\_\_\_\_. We have four children. We've planned to divide it up four ways later on. Well, it got changed. Now it's 10 acres and so it's not – I'm for Option 1. That's it.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Terry Dundsten, and next would be Bill Redding.

Teru Lundsten: Good evening. My name is Teru, T-e-r-u, Lundsten, L-u-n-d-s-t-e-n. Mailing address is P.O. Box 1376; physical, 14791 Taggart Quarry Road on South Fidalgo in Anacortes. I'm here to express my strong support for P-12, Option number 4, except for the unlimited square footage for public buildings. Those buildings should stay at a maximum of 33,000 square feet. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: \_\_\_ Bill Redding and then Jason Redding.

Bill Redding: I'm Bill Redding. We reside at – that's R-e-d-d-i-n-g – reside in Edison currently at 14137 Gilmore Avenue.

We purchased property about 10 years ago on South Fidalgo Island because of its unique characters. The reason we purchased it is because it had the – besides being a beautiful piece of property and it was agriculturally zoned. We plan on making – or *are* making use of that. We were allowed to build up to three residences on that property, which P-12 would eliminate that possibility. The two sons that plan on moving here, one is in the process and plans on building. This would eliminate his opportunity. Another son who will be speaking next has the future. In the future we hope to have him on the property also. And then we plan on living there throughout and age in place. We have a – currently farming it, restoring soils, et cetera, getting it ready. Part of our plan has been all along to raise plants, which requires a greenhouse, and I noticed that when this came up that that would be disallowed. I was surprised. What bothers me, I guess, most about it is we have spent so many years planning this and completely aboveboard looking for – okay, we're not going to try to usurp the system. Let's get the property with the rights to build on it to do this properly. Let's make sure that everything is good. The kids have been planning it for years. We've been working on it together for years. And to have that swept out from underneath you at my age is immoral, and it's very hard for me to understand how someone could support basically stealing my property, values, and opportunities, and giving it to somebody else or for someone else's agenda. I am totally in support of a rural Fidalgo Island but there's better ways to do this than to mandate an unfair, discriminatory process where people are not allowed to pursue their dreams, to exercise their liberty, and to enjoy life in pursuit of their happiness. Right? I hope you all consider no on P-12 and adopt Option 1. Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Jason Redding and next would be Andy Culbertson.

Jason Redding: It's difficult to follow my dad because he obviously has a lot more at stake. My name is Jason Redding. My residence is also currently in Edison, Washington – 14137 Gilmore Avenue, Edison, Washington. My last name is spelled R-e-d-d-i-n-g.

Yeah, my dad mentioned that there are two of his children specifically who are interested in moving to this property and that this property was specifically purchased with these rights attached to it. I am one of those sons who is interested in moving there and, I mean, aside from assisting my parents to age in place, but also to live on beautiful Fidalgo Island in this beautiful part of the country. My siblings have also expressed their interest in that. And not everyone – our family included – have the resources to always build pipelines and attach public water when there is even no issue that can be proven with this aquifer. So I can't imagine that these rights should be taken away from those who have planned on using them and utilizing them and followed the legal process to then be swept out from underneath them just because of some supposed water issue. You know, my parents have been working members of this county for – what? – 45, 50 years at least and this has been their dream their entire life. And this would be absolutely immoral and criminal to take this away from them.

I would just like to say I would like to direct your attention to your own recommendations from last year that there has been no evidence that the current zoning's not work the way it is intended to work, that allowed uses are appropriate for the area. And I would like to add to that that these outlandish uses that we saw here a few minutes ago all require special permits anyway. There's

no way that anyone could build these ridiculous things without first acquiring a special use permit and the permission of their neighbors. So this is already functioning. The special use permits are not unique to South Fidalgo. At that time there was significant opposition to the proposal and I see that there is continually significant opposition to this proposal, that property owners have expectations for the allowed uses in the zone to continue to be allowed – now that is our family's specific and most significant point – and that the Growth Management Act instructs them to manage growth, not stop it. So I urge you to please reconsider your position on this – adopting this, and adopt Option 1 to leave the zoning as it is currently constituted so that our family can enjoy its plans. Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Andy Culbertson, followed by Glen Strebe.

Andy Culbertson: Hi, my name's Andy Culbertson. Last name C-u-l-b-e-r-t-s-o-n. I have four properties in the affected area. I live at one of them at 5909 Campbell Lake Road.

I would hope that the Commission would accept or vote for Option 1. I am against P-12 and I have three reasons. The first is: Why do it? Solution looking for a problem predominates many of the comments that we've heard at this and other meetings. As was mentioned, the Rural Reserve code, 14.16.320, says the purpose of the Rural Reserve district is to allow low density development – so not to end development but to allow it – and to have limited employment and service opportunities for rural residents. What the code says – we've already heard some things about the code now in Option 4. I just went through and looked up each one of those items and I wanted to comment on a couple of them. One thing is we heard of the outdoor storage of hazardous materials. If you look it up it says the hazardous materials can have no potential health hazard, so to say that storing a bunch of hazardous materials is going to create a health hazard, the code prohibits it already. The off-road vehicle use it says "no friends or offsite family," so I take that if off-road vehicles, use areas, and trails are disallowed then it'll only be you and your closest friends – or not closest friends: you and your family, which would kind of be cool to see my wife riding a bike.

Display gardens. I looked up "display gardens." What was listed as display gardens was this: "Display gardens – horticultural gardens opened to the public, including ornamental plants." It doesn't talk about commercial activities. I take from this if you have – the public \_\_\_ to see your gardens for the Brooks Hospital Guild, that will be disallowed under this, which seems crazy to me.

And "Golf course: a recreational facility designed and developed for golf activities." It doesn't say anything about commercial. If I put a putting green in the back of my yard, am I outside of compliance? It seems crazy to me.

And what I think is what this code update/downgrade would – is missing the development angles of South Fidalgo Island. There's not going to be a lot of commercial activities. There hasn't been a lot of commercial activities. It's too expensive of land or the topography isn't good. It's not the land that's going to be developed in the way that other lands in the county will be. It's rugged. Many of it's State park or City forestland. It was interesting to hear somebody say that their address was Taggart Quarry Lane. I don't know if you know Dave Taggart. He was a hard-working guy and he did what I think symbolizes rural –

(sound of timer)

Mr. Culbertson: – life.

Chair Raschko: Thank you very much.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Glen Strebe. Mr. Strebe and he'll be followed by Scott Johnson.

Glen Strebe: My name is Glen Strebe. I live at 14198 Gibraltar Road. I built that house over 50 years ago and I'm still in it. The amount of traffic that you're talking about with making these changes is going to increase. We just experienced quite a bit with the roundabouts being installed on Gibraltar Road and the other one down at the bottom of the hill. And there's a number of reasons why we should not change what we've got going right now, and stay with it. There's – I know of three slide areas. Two are in the area where we have these changes proposed to be made. The amount of drainage systems that would need to be put in in order to accommodate a, shall we say, a deluge of water or whatever would cause a lot of problems. And to me the area is doing fine the way it is. Please don't change it. Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Mr. Scott Johnson, and after Mr. Johnson we'll have Jim McCarthy.

Scott Johnson: Scott Johnson, J-o-h-n-s-o-n. I reside at 11326 Havekost Road in Anacortes. I'm in support of Option 1. I also have lived in this community for over 20 years and I've watched my property rights dwindle down. I own more than one property on this island – my wife and I. And I think what we're looking at here is kind of an attitude that okay, I'm here. I'm done. I don't want *you* to change a thing. And I just would hope that you don't fall into the fear of what's going to happen because this might happen or that might happen, and make decisions on that. I know you're smarter people than that. So I just want to support Option 1. Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Jim McCarthy, and next would be Jean McCarthy.

Jim McCarthy: Hi, my name is Jim McCarthy, M-c-C-a-r-t-h-y, and I currently have a mailbox. I used to live in Skyline. I own property on Thistle Lane and Gibraltar, southeast corner. My current mailbox is 577 at Mailbox – I don't send it to myself so I've got to read this. I hope you don't mind – a private post office down there in Anacortes on Commercial.

Anyhow I don't know much about what's going on because I have a lot of trouble, frankly, reading everything – probably my age, perhaps – and understanding the PSJP and 8212 and 36-this and that. Right? And I don't know how many people here kind of feel the same way. It takes an attorney and all of the people that supply information to you to understand it. And I think, frankly, it's absurd that we're even having this hearing after listening to the gentleman here and his son talk about – God, it brings tears to my eyes, you know? It just shouldn't have to happen here. You know, we're not – most of the people here aren't rich and, you know, they just want to be left in peace. And to have a group that apparently nobody knows – or at least not very many people here do – tell them what they should do with their land doesn't seem to be correct. And – anyhow....



I'm not – I'm – Proposition 1, Do nothing. I've heard a couple sayings here which I think are great: You know, if it's not broken, don't fix it. And it's a – what did they say? Tell me. Give me a hint.

Unidentified male voice in the audience: A solution in search of a problem.

Mr. McCarthy: Yeah, a solution in search of a problem. And that's really what it sounds like. And I'm so happy you folks are able to come here and spend time with us tonight. I'm sorry that you have to do that.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Jean McCarthy, followed by Ellen Bynum.

(laughter and applause)

Mr. McCarthy: I guess she's not here.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Ellen Bynum, and after Ms. Bynum would be Glenn Dalglish.

Ms. Bynum: Good evening, Commissioners. Ellen Bynum, executive director, Friends of Skagit County.

I want to go back to the thing that I cited about the Quaker Cove information, and that is the final decision and order of *Evergreen Islands, et al. vs. Skagit County, Growth Management Hearings Board*. Friends believes this is a standing order that has not been fulfilled by Skagit County, and as a part of that order – I'll read you a piece of it – “The County must set a specific timetable for and firm commitment to the timely completion of this plan. The Fidalgo subarea plan must be completed and found to be compliant before the CaRD urban reserve development or any other increases in density are allowed to occur on the island.” That was in bold and it was in bold in the original. This case had a lot of different problems in it and Skagit County has managed to change and satisfy a lot of the problems. But one of the problems that is not satisfied is that we haven't done a subarea plan. Despite the fact that you have people who are here saying I'm for this, I'm against this, the great thing is that if you did a subarea plan and you recommend that to the County Commissioners and we find how to get money to do that, because we only have one planner now, I would expect everybody in this audience to participate. Because it's the subarea planning process that's going to determine not only what you get to do but what we've done in the past. And you're right. We haven't done too many things that have been horrible because we're still here and we're still a rural county and we still have rural character.

There're some other areas that we want to make comments in and I'll put them in my paperwork that I give to you, including the other issues. But I wanted to say that – also that the – so Friends recommends that the Planning Commission advise the Board of County Commissioners that PD&S needs to complete a subarea planning process for South Fidalgo that is fully compliant with GMA, that allows all citizen participation, and results in a document that can be adopted by the Board of County Commissioners. We urge the Board to allocate funds. We urge you to ask the Board to allocate funds (and) request grants funds or technical assistance from the State Department of Commerce to complete the subarea plan. We note that the *Evergreen Islands* case, of which Friends was a part, stated that no CaRDs be permitted in South Fidalgo until a community plan was completed. “Community plan” would be a subarea plan. And although the case did not address rezoning in the South Fidalgo area, we assume that compliance in completing a subarea plan should preclude any changing of densities –

(sound of timer)

Ms. Bynum: – that might be brought up by a rezone. I'll write more.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Glenn Dalgliesh, and then we'll have Meredith Lesley.

Glenn Dalgliesh: Good evening. My name's Glenn Dalgliesh, D-a-l-g-l-i-e-s-h. We've a property residence at 5022 Lake Erie Way, Anacortes, Washington. And I guess my problem is in effecting a new policy that affects so many people where the old policy doesn't seem to be hindering anybody. And it just doesn't seem right. I vote for no on P-12 and yes on Option 1.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. After Meredith Lesley we'll have Howard Gulley.

Meredith Lesley: Meredith Lesley, M-e-r-e-d-i-t-h. Lesley, L-e-s-l-e-y, 6639 Rykosa Lane in Anacortes. It's by Whistle Lake.

I came to this meeting tonight to learn more about what was going on. I've read all of the paperwork. I've gone to the website. I read the newspaper. I thought this doesn't sound good to me. It doesn't sound finished. It doesn't sound complete. And it was scary to me. Just the term "residential" as opposed to "rural" bothers me a lot. I much prefer "rural" and I want it to stay that way. I've learned a lot tonight from everybody I've listened to. Mr. Sagg, I think, mentioned the word "creep" and that kind of hit me like – because I couldn't understand what was being explained to me on that letter I received. It felt like there's some underlying reason this is being changed but nobody's really going to tell us, and I don't like it. It doesn't feel good. I live on an acres-and-a-half by Whistle Lake. I'm just inside the county line. I don't want anything there to change. I like it. I hope that you will consider Option 1. Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. After Mr. Gulley will be Krysta Verbarendse.

Howard Gulley: Good evening. My name is Howard Gulley, 13574 Tibbles Lane. I've got a little three-acre spot there that came when their zoning was two-and-a-half acres.

A little bit of history on this thing. This process here starts back with the Mayflower. It went halfway across the Atlantic when all of a sudden they wrote the Mayflower plaque where somebody felt it was important that they'd be able to dictate what everybody else did. We got rid of that and as results of that two interesting things happened we end up with Thanksgiving.

(laughter)

Mr. Gulley: It continues on, has been continuing on from Day 1, and it will continue on for years to come. Tom mentioned the fact in here that there was a survey done in 2006. As a result of that survey, which wasn't mentioned, the County Commissioners then estopped with it. A team that put together headed up, that did a survey for South Fidalgo area plan. The head of that one was Ed Goodman, the former sheriff of the county. And that team put forth there and in March of 2008 when they had the rough draft just ready to go out to print, all of a sudden the Save South Fidalgo people – relatives of the people on the Mayflower, I think – came after this thing and raised all kinds of hell and everybody backed away from it. I've talked with Ed – and, by the way, that plan is still – he still has a copy of that rough draft. So I'm proposing that we have Option 1(a): We do nothing now but next year we pull up the draft plan that was in 2008 and start working on that,

because that brought in people from all around. It took about 10 months and they looked at the lands that was available and everything else. And, oh, by the way, over 40% of our land is government land and mostly in parks. And 99-point some high number of the places in this country wished they had the water problem that we have. In most cases it's too much water. And when they talk about all these things, you know, they didn't take \_\_\_ the weather is, the lakes that are in here, and everything else. When you actually look at the number of sites that were available it was amazing. The maximum you could have – absolutely maximum you could have would be about 500, not the thousands that they're talking about.

The purpose of the Planning Department in its beginning was that your infrastructure didn't get outgrown. We're a little bit beyond that problem. The only infrastructure we have here is the traffic on Highway 20, and that's because of Whidbey Island and you're not changing that one.

(laughter)

Mr. Gulley: Okay. So what we need to do is Plan 1(a): Stop with this thing, kill it where it is now, and get on with revising –

(sound of timer)

Mr. Gulley: – what came in in 2008 and start looking at things realistically, which includes –

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Gulley: Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Ms. Verbarendse, and next would be John Enga.

Krysta Verbarendse: My name is Krysta Verbarendse. I live at 6192 Campbell Lake Road. I'm opposed to P-12, the rezone on South Fidalgo, and I ask that the Planning Commission choose Option 1, the no action alternative.

My concerns with this proposal are varied. I think it's arbitrary. I think it's against the will of the majority of the people that live in my community. And, frankly, I think it's illegal. In reading the P-12 proposal to amend the Comprehensive Plan, the Planning Department lays out changes that are intended to maintain the existing rural character and lifestyles of Fidalgo Island and in doing so allow for adequate supply of land use options to provide for housing for a wide range of types, densities, and incomes. The Planning Department's recommendation for Option 4 does not meet any of that criteria it's supposed to – it sets out to do. It simply limits the land use and the property rights that are currently enjoyed by one group of taxpaying landowners by rewriting a new and unique zone, the South Fidalgo Rural Residential. For instance, the proposal that limits the housing density on only part of South Fidalgo, all the land in Rural Reserve, encompasses about 4,000 acres but it doesn't even attempt to touch the land within the Rural Intermediate – 3,000 acres that lives literally across the street right next door, that they already have twice the density. You will note that much of the Rural Intermediate land sits on the water or with water view, while the majority of the Rural Reserve land is inland. So effectively the Planning Department will be spot-zoning, encouraging growth along our shorelines with increased density in exclusive and expensive residential areas, while discouraging growth on the more affordable inland properties.

*How does this provide housing for a wide range of types, densities, and income levels in my community in South Fidalgo?*

Further, the proposal eliminates the CaRD density bonuses for properties without access to public water. In the current Rural Reserve zoning, landowners don't need access to public water to apply for the density bonus, but the rezone would put the burden and the expense of bringing in water from possibly miles away into this land just to have two homes on 10 acres. That's the max density that they have currently – two homes on 10 acres. So the question is why. Why is the County requiring rural property owners to seek public water on Fidalgo Island? We don't have a water crisis. We don't have a sole source aquifer. The Planning Department has neglected to do any water studies so this requirement is both arbitrary and discriminatory: in favor of one zone and not another; in favor of wealthy people rather than those that currently own the land with hopes of aging in place with their families around them. Per the RCW and the Countywide Planning Policies manual, it says "Property rights of landowners shall be protected from arbitrary and discriminatory action."

And it was the Commission's statement just last year that said property purchasers have expectations for the allowed –

(sound of timer)

Ms. Verbarendse: – uses in their zone. Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. After John Enga, it will be Katherine Pittis.

John Enga: Hi there. My name's John Enga, E-n-g-a. I live at 4052 Thunder Lane, Anacortes. I live in the proposed area of change.

I moved my family up here five years ago to start an organic berry farm and winery in that property. It took us about four years to find a place that had the usage and the area that we wanted to move into. We found it, spent the last five years putting in the infrastructure and putting the plants in the ground and working really hard on building this dream for my family. And this proposal, although I don't think it would shut the whole thing down, would *severely* hamper many of the plans I had for this property and for my family. So to wrap it up, I mean, many of the people who have spoken here before have listed out many of my objections, although it doesn't seem clear; it's not a transparent process on how this is going on. And I would say Option 1 is my choice. Leave it as is. I signed a declaration saying that I was moving into the Skagit County agricultural corridor and there was a huge list of things that I would have to contend with if I was to choose to buy this piece of property. Well, I signed that list knowingly looking it as a permission slip for many of the things that I would *have* to do to run a small farm. Not a big one – I've got a five-acre lot. It's a small farm, but it's going to make some of the choices that I have to make for my family and for my farm difficult if this passes. Thank you for listening to our comments tonight.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. And next would be John Flowers.

Kathy Pittis: My name is Kathy Pittis, P-i-t-t-i-s, and I reside at 7008 Sunrise Estates Drive. I'm going to read this so I stay within the time limit.

I oppose P-12 and I support Option 1. P-12 undermines property rights, exacerbates the social divide by limiting further the availability of property, the ingenuity available for those seeking to work hard and supplement the ability to live, work, play, contribute, and be good stewards of this *amazing* environment we call home. I want to ensure to the best of my ability all my children's chances to grow their family here if they so choose and not be regulated and zoned out of pursuing their dreams. P-12 will erode this opportunity. You want to be the one to tell my daughter, who emigrated from Ghana, West Africa, that she no longer can be a country vet? Because that's her dream. Also what you've proposed – and I did fact-check this today – does exactly that, along with not allowing friends to ride ATVs or motorcycles on property or to board a dog to be bred or trained. And yes, I'm talking just one dog.

We want to keep doors open for our youth to learn to lead independent lives. And I also ask that you enable us to age in place as we supplement our ability to live here. If you approve any option but Option 1 on P-12, you take all this away from us *and* for the next generations. I do not understand this. I'm a former Anacortes School Board member and a current Port of Anacortes Commissioner. And although I am not wearing a political hat tonight, I have heard time and time again in these roles to not have government restrict the ability of individuals to become productive citizens that give back to their community in which they have invested. These are the coaches, the volunteers, the ones wanting to continue a healthy, independent legacy. P-12 does undermine this healthy, independent legacy. Overly restrictive land use laws not only drive NIMBYism but is also economically damaging, and makes housing less affordable, and holds back the very clustering that drives innovation, productivity, and growth. While that might not have been the original intent of zoning laws in years past, when taken together these regulations have a substantial negative effect on the economy, adding up to more than a trillion dollars a year or nearly 10% of GDP, according to one estimate. I can track in my time as a property owner on South Fidalgo how over the years these collective zoning laws have eroded my ability to live here and have threatened my ability to age in place.

Additionally, a February 2016 Economic Report of the President and in a follow-up report, the Obama administration indicated that unduly strict land use regulations as leading to damaging rents and holding back, and I quote: "American innovation and economic progress."

I ask: Are you trying to further exacerbate the social divide, contribute to the housing crisis, grow a future generation dependent on government that continues to add to the GDP? Or do you believe in protecting –

(sound of time)

Ms. Pittis: – innovation and economic progress?

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. After Mr. Flowers will be Patty Wasson.

John Flowers: Hi, John Flowers, 6080 Campbell Lake Road, and I am strongly opposed to P-12. I believe the restrictions as are defined today are very vague at best, and it also attempts to correct problems that just don't exist today. It also limits the very essence of why so many of us choose to live in the country. We have – personally we have two organic gardens and a decent size orchard. 90% of the fruit and vegetables are consumed onsite or given away to neighbors. My wife meticulously maintains the gardens along with the potting shed. I think if you were driving by,

you could argue that that's a display garden, and I would ask again: Is that something that would no longer be permitted?

ATVs: Speaking on – as far as folks on Campbell Lake Road, in 15 years I've seen two ATVs being ridden. One, my grandson owns, rides it on our property five or six times a year. The second is owned by Mr. Verbarendse, who rode his about four years ago.

(laughter)

Mr. Flowers: So Campbell Lake Road, not a real problem with ATVs. We also have a multi-terrain vehicle that we use for hauling vegetables and landscape maintenance, et cetera. You could argue that that's an ATV again. Would something like that be allowed or not allowed? And my point to this is, as I read the P-12 initiative now, it's just very vague and it worries me on how those could be interpreted over the long run.

Anaerobic digesters. Everything I've read says that this is pretty good technology if you need it. To me, an anaerobic digester would be dealt with like a septic system. If you need it, you apply for a permit and it's either a go or a no-go. To flat say no on an anaerobic digester, I'm just not sure I understand that.

In closing I would just like to say there's a reason why we choose to live in the country. We would ask that you not let people that don't have a stake in our property control what we want to do on our property.

(applause)

Mr. Flowers: We are – I believe we're all responsible, law-abiding citizens. I never hear anyone complain driving down the road about what we do on our property, and we would, again, just ask that you don't start to restrict what we moved to the country to do in the first place. Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Patty Wasson, and after that would be Bob Shelly.

Patty Wasson: Hi, I'm Patty Wasson, W-a-s-s-o-n, 14748 Rosario Road, and I do live in the rezoning area.

So the main thing I want to say – I wrote a two-page thing. I decided just to scrap that because the main thing I want to say is that P-12 does not change density housing regulations. That's set by the Growth Management Act. And those regulations are already in place and would not be affected by P-12. And it also allows for a CaRD density bonus, which is currently the current usage. It will change the hookups to public water. We have lived on our property for 30 years and we have a public water system which in the minimum of public water systems that means two houses or two – not families, but two landowners sharing the same well. And so what we have to do is every year get our water tested, which should be done anyway. So there's – as far as the off-road use, that's for commercial use only, not private land use. So the creation of a public water system is the main thing I wanted to bring up because it's not as big a deal as what I hear other people saying. So thank you.

Chair Raschko: Bob Shelly, please, and then Jim Kenote.

Bob Shelly: Bob Shelly, S-h-e-l-l-y. I live at 14748 Rosario Road in Anacortes. This is the first time I've spoken in public so please bear with me if I don't get my words right. But I'm very concerned about South Fidalgo. I've lived there for over 40 years. I've had a wonderful life and I think, like most of us that live there, we don't really want to see that change.

I would like to address some of the concerns that some of the gentlemen have who have bought land here believing that they could put in certain types of businesses. I think that's the very reason why we need to define what *is* going to be accessible from here on out so people don't buy property thinking that they can have an ATV resort or thinking that they can have a gun range or thinking that they can have a dog kennel next to your property. I guarantee all those people on Campbell Lake Road who don't see that that's a possibility that that could happen there because there already is so much density there. They want to build – allow people to build things out in the other part of the country where it won't bother them. If any of those things were right next to their house I guarantee you they wouldn't like it either. So I'm very much in favor of this proposal and I think it would limit some of the people that would think that they're buying land here for some of these businesses that really are not appropriate for our island. They would know before they invested rather than afterwards what they could and couldn't do here. Thank you very much.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Jim Kenote and then we would have Rob Bamesberger.

James Kenote: My name's James Keynote. I live at 4204 Sharpe Road, Anacortes. We also have property under Trinity LLC. I'd like for the sake of time to address one objection made by Tom Conroy tonight, who was in favor of P-12. I am *not* in favor of P-12 and I'm in favor of Option 1. He made the argument that all he wants to do is essentially preserve the status quo and keep the continuity of the island as it is. Well, I'm here to tell Tom and anyone else that I've lived on this island for 30 years. I built my house, I built my shop, and I built my garage. My in-laws have lived there probably 50-something years – the late Norrie Estvold, who Bill knows. We've taken care of the land. We've been good stewards of it. But about 25 years ago my land went for no reason other than the argument at the GMA – went from two-and-a-half-acre minimums. A moratorium was thrown on which was then renewed and renewed and renewed, and finally when they came out of it my lands now has to – is – can fully – has a 10-acre minimum development. Now where is it right that the value of my land now – that I can't subdivide it and give it to my children? It devalued my land. And now here we go again, another round trying to do some more of the same kind of nonsense. So yes, I'm very much opposed to this. Thank you very much.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Mr. Bamesberger and then Corinne Salcedo. I don't know if I'm saying that right: B-a-m-e-s-b-e-r-g-e-r? Must not be here. So we'll have Corinne Salcedo, please.

Unidentified male voice in the audience: Tim, what number of speaker are you on?

Chair Raschko: Well, there are some blanks on the page but we're at number 39.

Corinne Salcedo: Corinne Salcedo, C-o-r-i-n-n-e S-a-l-c-e-d-o. I want South Fidalgo to retain its rural character with no additional industries. I support the P-12 Option 4 but would like maximum public building lot coverage to be maintained at 33,000 square feet. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Richard Bergner and then Maetja – I'm going to try to say it right – Verbarendse.

Richard Bergner: Richard Bergner, B-e-r-g-n-e-r. I live at 15515 Yokeko Drive on Fidalgo Island. I support P-12. I support the 4<sup>th</sup> option, except for the Planning Commission's request for unlimited square footage coverage. 33,000 square feet is large enough.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Maetja Verbarendse, and followed by Austin Portis.

Maetja Verbarendse: Hi, my name is Maetja Verbarendse. It's spelled M-a-e-t-j-e V-e-r-b-a-r-e-n-d-s-e. I live at 6192 Campbell Lake Road. I have grown up in the Rural Reserve land on South Fidalgo and I am opposed to P-12. I am here to urge you to choose Option 1 and preserve the rural character that we residents currently enjoy.

Having the privilege of growing up in the county has given me and my family certain freedoms that we have incorporated into our daily lifestyle. From ages three to 10 I frequently helped out in my neighbors' display garden. It really is that pretty. When I got a motorcycle at age nine I would go out and ride with my dad. That is now being threatened if I were to have friends over. When I was 11 I learned how to drive in the neighbor's golf cart, not my golf cart. And for my entire life I have been flying with my dad, which was initially something that was threatened. Display gardens, off-road vehicle use for anyone other than your family, motorcycle tracks, and aviation are all things that I enjoyed growing up that did not bother anyone else and now are things that are being threatened without any evidence, reason, or logical thought.

Proponents of this rezone have constructed a strawman of a scene in the slideshow before, driving irrational fear of big business taking over South Fidalgo. If that was truly a risk, why has it not already happened? Why are we not already seeing it? Is our permitting process not already adequate? The land in South Fidalgo is far too expensive to be used by businesses and the surrounding infrastructure is not conducive for exportation. Instead, South Fidalgo is used by families for small, agricultural businesses, legacy properties, and the opportunities to age in place. As the next generation, the generation that you should be considering when going forward in growth management, it frustrates me to see the rights of me and my family, and eventually rights I want to share with my own family, taken away on the account of a loud minority. I urge you to drive down Campbell Lake Road, Sharpe Road, or any of the other roads that are in the affected zone and see the opposition signs; I urge you to see the lifestyle that people have built; and most of all, I urge you to think about the quality of life for multiple generations that you are sacrificing in this rezone. I spent the afternoon compiling a list of over 150 names that had contacted us – all of those that represent over a thousand acres in this rezone and others that oppose P-12, and I wish the Option 1, the no change option, is the one that you guys pursue and represent the wishes of the wild minority – or majority. Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Austin Portis and then Katie Rowley.

Austin Portis: My name is Austin Portis. I live at 7371 Remington Lane, spelled just like the gun company. Last name P-o-r-t-i-s. I've been a resident on South Fidalgo Island for 29 years. I am a property owner in the area. I've seen it change from quarter-acre minimums. Most people here talk about 2.5 acres. I mean, it was even smaller before. We continue to get regulations thrust on us without the majority's option. I'm in strong opposition to P-12. I propose that you pick Option 1. If there was an option to roll back even further I would suggest that. Those are the options I



have right now. So I'm in strong opposition to P-12 and I encourage you to pick P-1 – or Option 1 in the P-12 plan. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Katie Rowley, and followed by Ashley Rowley.

Katie Rowley: My name is Katie Rowley, R-o-w-l-e-y. I own Rural Reserve land at 5737 Campbell Lake Road and I am opposed to the P-12. Choose Option 1. Do not change South Fidalgo. If you choose Option 1, there will still never be a racetrack. There's one twenty minutes away. There will never be a second golf course or another cemetery or manure lagoons. Land is too expensive, it's too far from major transport, and the infrastructure isn't here to support it.

Hazardous materials are not even an allowed use. Big business is about making big money and South Fidalgo is not where heavy commercial will set up because it is not economically viable to do so. Intense development like condos are not allowed. If every single CaRD-eligible lot were to use its density bonus those lots would have a density of one home per seven-point-five acres – hardly high density.

What we need to consider is what will happen if it *does* pass. This rezone discriminates against poor people. By eliminating CaRD density bonuses to land with public water it limits density only for people that do not have money to bring public water to their land. The vast majority of Fidalgo residents add Skagit River water to the aquifer and do not draw from the aquifer. A small percentage of the population actually do and I am one of them.

Consider families that have owned land for decades with the intent of giving their local children the ability to build homes on South Fidalgo or that have planned on building a home for aging in place. They lack the money to bring public water to their property. If they do, they will not use it but they will sell it to someone else who does and will. The P-12 discriminates against the poor. It blocks aging in place, retirement incomes, and inheritance plans. It reduces affordable housing. It blocks environmentally-friendly technology by banning anaerobic digesters. This is an EPA-approved renewable energy source. It is currently being scaled down for home use. Why would we block this? It also would diminish local farming by banning storage of natural materials, which affects me. More importantly, it also blocks greenhouses. South Fidalgo will never have a major wholesale nursery. I would love to buy locally grown lettuce and tomatoes that a neighbor grew instead of buying produce that's shipped from all over the world. Let's keep it local and reduce fossil fuel usage.

The Department's only explanation for the P-12 is to preserve the rural character, yet the Washington Administrative Code gives a legal definition of rural character and the Department's recommendation directly opposes it. It states first that rural character allows open space to dominate over the built environment, but the Department is recommending eliminating any maximum lot coverage for major public works. It states secondly that rural character fosters rural-based economies and opportunities to both live and work in rural areas, yet the Department recommends eliminating economic opportunities.

Preserve rural character. No P-12. Option 1. Don't change South Fidalgo.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Ashley Rowley, followed by Vim Houppermans.

Ashley Rowley: Hi, my name is Ashley Rowley and I oppose the P-12 – or I am for the – I oppose the P-12. I'm sorry. I'm getting nervous here. I live at 5737 Campbell Lake Road and I just implore you to please choose Option 1.

I would like you when doing that to consider logic, reason, science, and the law, because currently I believe the P-12 breaks all of these. Thank you for your time.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Am I pronouncing this right: Houppermans?

Wim Houppermans: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Wim Houppermans. I live at 3412 K Avenue, Anacortes, and before I lived at Biz Point.

I care about South Fidalgo. I am here to talk in favor of P-12, Option 4, I think. Planning is a great thing and planning does include which uses you should *not* allow in a region like that, and that's exactly what this proposal does. I also want to say that the idea that a racetrack right now is allowed in South Fidalgo and that the conditional use permit process is not going to protect against uses like that; it's going to allow it. It just would impose a restriction on its use, like not Sundays at midnight. So with that, thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Laure? I'm sorry. I'm having difficulty reading some of this but I believe it's Louanne Sherman.

Commissioner Mitchell: Or Laure.

Chair Raschko: It could be Laure.

Laure Sherman: It is Laure.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. And that'd be followed by Jan –

Commissioner Mitchell: Robinson.

Chair Raschko: Oh, Robinson. Jan Robinson? Thank you.

Ms. Sherman: Hi, I'm Laure Sherman, S-h-e-r-m-a-n. I live at 4596 Ginnett Road and I've lived here on South Fidalgo Island for 30 years. The population of our island, as with the whole world, has grown and continues to grow, and my concern is to ensure that we create standards that provide for clean air and clean water for the future generations. So we have to proceed with caution in our developments to maintain the natural filters that exist in open land and forested hillsides. At this time most people in P-12 draw water from their own wells and they manage their own septic system. Both Campbell Lake and Lake Erie have toxic algae now and have to be treated for it so that we can still enjoy using it, and both have increased density in the last 30 years right around the lake. The decisions made today will impact the future and hold the power to change forever the quality of all our lives, and for this reason I have been *for* the Option 4 on P-12. It seems to me after listening to everybody tonight that we could refine some of those things.

I am an investor in the methane digester that Tom put up there, and I know that the Janicki family has developed a smaller system that might be really great to have if – you know, with the tribe putting in their cultural center. Some of these other kinds of things. But it's not – so we haven't defined those uses within that. I mean, with CaRDs, we all know that you get an extra house, right? Plus you've got your mother-in-laws or the overhead garages, and that ends up being a lot of poop, you know? And we've got to think about how we're going to perc it. You have your one-acre so you're happy about that but, I mean, at some point we have to really think about the science of it all. I mean, I'm actually sort of *with* a lot of the statements. I feel like together we could probably create a better solution than we have right here, but I know there has to be constraints that we agree to and probably not everybody's going to love it. But the bottom line is we all need air and water and if we don't manage ourselves properly we won't have it, you know? Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Ms. Robinson, and then Roger Pearce.

Jan Heald Robinson: My name is Jan Heald Robinson. That's H-e-a-l-d. I live at 3660 Rosario Crest Lane. That's Anacortes, Rosario Beach. And we've owned that property for 40 years and, as Mr. Gulley said, some people have been here since the Mayflower. Well, it's not quite that long but it is 1885 our family's been there.

So we do have a vested interest. Our children also have a vested interest, as all of yours do. I understand that; however, I want to just say – I'll just say it first so you get it clear: I support P-12. I support the fourth option. I request that the lot coverage be limited to 33,000 as the Samish have requested.

But I do want to say that any of these things that we're trying to avoid in South Fidalgo, we're trying to avoid commercial and industrial applications. An anaerobic digester that's *for your home* or for the Samish cultural center is for their personal use or for your personal use. But anything that is like the major ones – and I really – the first one I'd ever seen was in Richmond, B.C., and it's fairly large and it is true that it's actually doing a whole commercial area. But I think that you want to be really careful about saying "I want these things next to my house." Well, as someone said, it's not going to happen on Campbell Lake. But it *is* going to happen on other properties that are open at this point. So we want to be careful about these things. So I want to say I support P-12.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Roger Pearce and then Tim Lewis.

Roger Pearce: Thank you, Commissioners. Board, thank you for the time you put in. We've seen you about three or four times the last couple years. Roger Pearce, P-e-a-r-c-e, 3692 Biz Point Road, Anacortes.

The last time we were here it seemed like most of the people were in favor of the P-12 concept, and it was well-intended, a lot of support. The *Anacortes American* came out with an article and,

man, there was fear in the neighborhood. The signs went up, the drums started being beat. It's confusing. We're doing well. Our area's great. Everybody says let's keep it the way it is. That's right. Let's protect it against commercial and industrial uses.

Going quickly to the 10-acre comment. That's been in force for a long time. This has nothing to do with it. The Planning Commission controls that, right? Or who controls the 10 acres? I don't know, but it's been around for a while and it's nothing to do with this. We're concerned about large-scale commercial and industrial applications.

I support P-12, Option 4. You can have a racetrack for your kids. You can't have a commercial racetrack, charge admission, have hot dog stands – stuff like that. You know, that's all we're doing. With the temperature rising around the world, we're seeing a reduction in the availability of clean water. Whether you want to accept that or not, we're reaching the time when water's probably going to be more expensive than booze. But that's a long ways away. Clean water *is* limited on South Fidalgo. They have not done an aquifer study. We know that. Our neighborhood has three wells. We are concerned about the availability of water by what we see in those wells.

Commercial and industrial applications and water shortage are in direct conflict with one another. There's no doubt about it. You're going to put something big in there, you're going to need water. So all we're talking about is large-scale commercial and industrial applications. Everything else could be ironed out.

You know, current \_\_\_\_ time and application that is allowed under the current zoning and submitted for commercial or industrial businesses, it has to go through a hearing process. Okay? Because it's there, they have to be heard. You know, if you have one of these businesses that you say you don't mind moving in next to you on Campbell Lake Road, I bet you do mind. You don't want that stuff. It hurts your property values. So what do you do? You appeal –

(sound of timer)

Mr. Pearce: – when people – okay. I didn't know I was that long.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, sir. Tim Lewis, and then Cindy Petrich.

Tim Lewis: My name is Tim Lewis. I live at 4888 Deer Haven Lane in Bow, Washington. I do not live in, obviously, or have an interest in that property but I do live in a Rural Reserve area, and it concerns me very, very much that we have going down the road, where there's a group of people that are trying to push an agenda. It clearly states in chapter 14 under the Zoning, to benefit the public as a whole and not any specific person or group of persons. If you look at this, in the meeting of July 24<sup>th</sup>, it was clearly said that it was a *citizen*-initiated petition. A group of people. It was a citizen-initiated. There is a mechanism in place right now that is more than adequate under the permitted use. If that doesn't work, you go to administrative. And if that doesn't work, you go to a Hearing Examiner. So there is a mechanism in place where this can all take place without doing a blanket. And then the danger is is it'll move on to other Rural Reserve areas, and I am very much against that.

In the July 24<sup>th</sup> meeting – after reading it – several of the Commissioners, as well as – they indicated that there's no problem. Commissioner Wesen said there's no problem. Why are we trying to fix something that isn't broke? And I think – let's see, the lady's name here – Stacie Pratschner. She indicated that the citizen-initiated petition and the Commission did not

recommend the adoption of it. But it got re-examined again and again and again and here we are today.

One of the things that I did notice in all of the submissions was everybody's worried about water. Water, water, water. And I thought, well, how come there's never been a study? So I did my own little study. I went to the Department of Ecology, and in the last 20 years – now this is – and I'm being very generous, if you go and look at the map. The last 20 years there's been 147 wells drilled in the Rural Reserve on Fidalgo, and that's about 7.4 wells a year. However – what people don't realize, 185 wells were decommissioned at that same time. So we have a net – there's 40 less wells there over the last 20 years. So there is – you know, I don't know if there's a shortage of water. I looked at some of the things – a half-a-gallon a minute, one-and-a-half gallons a minute. That's not good, I agree, but still: Is there a shortage of water? So I'm opposed to P-12, definitely opposed, and Option 1 –

(sound of timer)

Mr. Lewis: – should be the only thing. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Cindy Petrich and then Barbara Bracht.

Cindy Petrich: My name's Cindy Petrich and I've lived at 5501 Campbell Lake Road for 30 years. And I've seen some changes. There's been a little more building. I wouldn't say that the building around the lakes has been exorbitant on either Campbell Lake or Lake Erie, especially Lake Erie. A lot of those things were already purchased and planned on being built when people retired. The very first thing I did when I came here was call up the County and talk to them about wells, and I says, Have you ever done an aquifer study? What? Do you know how much that costs? No! No, we haven't done one. My God, where would we get the money for that? That was 30 years ago. Now everybody's, like, water, water, water.

We're planning on staying in our house till we croak. That's what we got it for. We're giving it to our kids. Both of them aren't going to stay there. They'd kill each other. But if – literally – but if one wanted to come and stay or maybe build a cabin or put an annex on to the garage, why would they have to have City water brought in? That is specifically the very reason why we bought out there, so that we could be independent. We put in a new well. We put in a new septic that pumps and does everything, and the water comes out 89% potable. And we've been pretty good caretakers of the property. We've had livestock, chickens, ducks, horses, and we have never had complaints from neighbors about any of the animals, although I don't think that's an issue on there. I'm confused by P-12. I oppose it. I think Option 1 is the best option.

I don't think there's been much transparency at all about this. I'm very confused about what they want and what they don't want. I'm confused about the wording. I think there are a lot of things that we probably do have in common. I just don't like to see things pushed, railroaded in, done so in a manner when people don't know about. A survey in 2006: I think I would remember that. Maybe it happened and it got recycled. I don't know, but I sure as heck never filled out a form – anybody asking me about anything about what I want to see done at the property. The only thing I know was when they were doing the rezoning and the 10-acre thing, and I know a lot of people put in a lot of hard time and work on it. And I just think while they might have really good ideas,

their ideas to me seem confusing, kind of farfetched. The wording is confusing. It wasn't done with any/much transparency or knowledge, and I think there needs to be years of exploration on this before you just decide –

(sound of timer)

Ms. Petrich: – to just blanket this. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Barbara Bracht and then Konrad Kurp. Is Barbara Bracht here? All right, how about Konrad Kurp?

Commissioner Annie Lohman: Mr. Chairman, she's stuck in the middle.

Chair Raschko: Oh, she's stuck? Wait a minute.

(inaudible comments from several Planning Commissioners)

Chair Raschko: Okay, so Barbara Bracht is not going to speak. We'll have Konrad Kurp, please, and then Kamiyo Culbertson.

Konrad Kurp: Ready to go? Konrad Kurp, South Fidalgo Island, 40-plus years' resident. Worked on the Planning Commission which developed that big plan which failed, and we ended up with the order still to come up with one. So we don't really have the choice to do nothing. We're ordered to do something, to come up with the comprehensive plan. Now the County doesn't want to spend the money, which is – I don't know. But, so this proposal gets us by for right now, I think. It's not perfect. It doesn't change anything what people are doing already. It prevents things which we were threatened with in the past. When people say, Oh, this will never happen, you are surprised what applications come up. We had a waterslide park, we had a atomic reactor, we had a bottle plant, we had – all kinds of things come up when you have the big property and somebody buys it and has an idea, he comes up with something which you will never dream about.

So it's preventing something. And if we see the change over the decades, how the population increases dramatically, I don't think we have the option not to do anything for the future. We need to do something for the future. And one thing is, what do they want to preserve? Do they want to preserve it all, or do we want to hang onto the idea of the American property rights? Everybody can do what they want. Or do we want to think about the community, what's good for the community at large? And if you have a little city and they own some park land, at the time in the planning commission they got heavily attacked: We have too many trees already on the island. And \_\_\_\_.

Okay, I'm for the P-12 and keep the lid on the lot coverage. Don't open it up. You will be surprised what \_\_ we will be asked to permit. So this is not an option to do nothing. It isn't. We need a plan –

(sound of timer)

Mr. Kurp: – and what I got reminded from the families –

Chair Raschko: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Kurp: All right. That's chain immigration.

Chair Raschko: Ms. Culbertson, and then after Ms. Culbertson will be Bill Wooding.

Kamiyo Culbertson: Hi, my name is Kamiyo Culbertson. It's K-a-m-i-y-o C-u-l-b-e-r-t-s-o-n. I live at 5909 Campbell Lake Road. I've lived on Fidalgo for over 50 years. My husband and I – I'm opposed to P-12. I'm for Option 1. My husband and I own several properties along Campbell Lake Road and I think we as – I think everybody here probably, we bought our property. We bought it knowing what restrictions were on it. We knew what we could and couldn't do on that and we bought it that way and that's how we intended to use it. So I don't think it's right. I think that's what this *is* about is property rights – that our property rights are being chopped, chopped, chopped, chopped, chopped. My mother was up here earlier. She and my father bought property, 20 acres, with a certain intent to give us each five acres, and then that was shot. They couldn't do that. It's just one thing after another. Our rights are being taken away. I think when you buy your property it is, that's the way you should be able to use it and it shouldn't be taking, you know, our plans away. You know, whether it's your farm or whatever plans you have on there. So I'm highly opposed to P-12. I'm for Option 1. Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Bill Wooding and then Dawn Greenfield.

Bill Wooding: Bill Wooding, 13540 Rosario Road. It sounds like I've probably lived out here longer than anyone here. And over the years I've been involved in a lot of things that have gone on. I was a member of the South Fidalgo subarea plan committee and we worked on that for two years, not six months, and we came to a conclusion that we voted on two-and-a-half acres and that's what our committee came to. The County did not like or somebody did not like that, so they just arbitrarily threw out two years' worth of work that we had put into this thing. That was Ed Goodman ran that committee. During that period of time we were – we had asked for water studies, we had asked for what the density was going to be required, how many usable acres there are on the island, once you take the mountain out, you take the lakes, wetlands, and all the rest of it out. And based on in 2008 there wasn't enough land that at that time what GMA mandated Fidalgo Island to have.

Now here we are talking about adding more restrictions. Like I said, I've been here for 60 years. The density that has happened out there has been the Rancho San Juan/Del Mar. They had lots. They filled out Seaview, which is a subdivision I actually built. It's been building out. But even with the two-and-a-half-acre zoning that we would have had, we still wouldn't have had the density that is mandated by GMA. And at the time we did GMA, we said this had – the County told us this *had* to get done, and they had promised us – in fact, I asked Ed Goodman the only way I'd be on that committee is if what we vote on, you approve and accept. And he said he would and he said the Commissioners would and they didn't. So and at that time I've acquired – I own approximately 100 acres that I've accumulated over the years. I didn't start out rich. You know, I started out like everybody else. I bought a lot – \$500 down and \$25 a month – on Lake Erie, and over the years as land became available, I bought it up as buffer zones primarily to keep people from complaining about the possible noises that would come out of my gravel pit. And so I owned most of the land around my property, then with the idea that I would subdivide that into one-acre parcels. At that time, Seaview, you could have four lots to the acre. And when the GMA came in they took my

property and said it was Rural Reserve and one house for 40 acres. It didn't cost me anything for them to do that, but for me to put it back into 10 acres –

(sound of timer)

Mr. Wooding: – so I could CaRD it, I spent about \$30,000. So –

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Mr. Wooding: – these are facts and you can look them up, and –

Chair Raschko: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Wooding: – you know, we talked about – sorry. I could go on for a couple hours.

(laughter and applause)

Chair Raschko: Dawn Greenfield and then Paul Weisz.

Dawn Greenfield: I'm Dawn Greenfield, G-r-e-e-n-f-i-e-l-d, and I live at 14162 Gibraltar Road. I live on 10 acres. I've lived there for 21 years. I think I'm kind of an interesting part in this in that I did go through the special permit process. It was grueling and it cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. I run an event venue. People love to get married on my property.

What you need to know is that my neighbors – like Glenn Strebe; he said he lived there for 50 years – so all of my neighbors, if you can imagine, they have lived there for, like, 40, 50 years, my immediate neighbors. And they okayed this process. And I went through the hoops of the County to do what I do. What I'm mostly here to say is that I'm opposed to P-12 and I'm for the 1 plan, number 1, because I think there are plans in place to allow a person like me who ended up with 10 acres with some outbuildings that were built on the property with permits. And hard work was put into bringing a couple of Scottish Highland cows, chickens. I like to grow sunflowers. People love to get married there, and isn't that a wonderful thing? Marriage and love. And it was my cows and my chickens and I that together we woo-hoed that we had gotten through this process. So and I'm so grateful to my neighbors, so grateful to get to do what I do now. I used to be a schoolteacher of primary children. And I like what I get to do. I love South Fidalgo and my grandchildren love to hang out with me. And so thank you very much.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Paul Weisz and then Kathryn Alexander.

Paul Weisz: My name is Paul Weisz and I reside at 13206 Gibraltar Road in Anacortes. I want to thank you, Commissioners – Planning Commissioners – for your commitment, your time, your leadership. But I want to go on record as saying as a resident of South Fidalgo I am definitely against this rezone as it's currently proposed, and I ask you to please accept Option 1.

Now my profession is real estate, and as a realtor and as an advocate for my clients in this area I also strongly oppose this rezone. I'm a past president of the North Puget Sound Association of Realtors. I'm an active member. I've been on the board of the Washington State Realtors. And I can say that everybody I've talked to in those organizations is strongly against this rezone. We're a very active committee.



As a homeowner and realtor, I believe this proposal infringes upon basic rights of real estate ownership and my first pledge as a realtor is a pledge we all take – anybody who has that big “R” by their name – is to protect the individual rights of home ownership and to broaden the opportunity to enjoy it. And I believe this proposal, P-12, infringes on those rights. I’ve inquired widely. I’ve really tried to look into this and understand what this is about, and tonight it’s still not very clear though I believe somebody here said something – we could find some common ground, but not the way this has been gone about. But I have not seen/heard anything as to why this rezone is necessary or beneficial to the residents, nor has it been voiced clearly as to how our current system – how the conditional use process fails us.

Moving forward with this proposal right now is a big mistake. Any future efforts to move forward should include representation from both sides. And I say that because I want to point out my impression of this, and I came to the party late. My impression of this, though, is that this is very one-sided how it’s been planned. I tried to get in a voice in this several months ago to hear, and it was, like, no, it’s closed doors. We don’t want to hear anything else – whoever was putting this together. And it reminds me, it reminds me very much of what happened to those of us who have been against this. We’ve had our signs stolen twice – hundreds of signs, three times for some people – that say “No P-12” throughout Fidalgo – throughout Gibraltar Road, throughout Lake Campbell Road. And to me, people who are going about this under the cover of darkness and stealing signs to get their sign/their side more voice: I don’t trust them. I honestly don’t trust them.

(sound of timer)

Mr. Weisz: This is a solution looking for a problem, as it’s been said before.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: We’d have Kathryn Alexander and then Bryce Nickel. Pardon me?

Unidentified male voice in the audience: Kathryn is no longer here.

Chair Raschko: Okay, then Bryce Nickel and then somebody named Wetcher. I cannot read the first name. I apologize.

Bryce Nickel: My name is Bryce Nickel, N-i-c-k-e-l. I live at 4203 Sharpe Lane, Anacortes, Washington, and I am strongly against P-12.

I am a third generation representing the three generations of family members. One first generation \_\_\_\_, second generation had 10, third generations. We’re strongly against P-12 because it would prevent us from developing our land in the future, which is our plans. Well, we haven’t made a business plan or anything but some of our family members would like to do greenhouses \_\_\_\_ all their houses \_\_\_\_\_ houses, because we like to grow plants and live off the land.

One of my family members in the second generation has discussed doing log cabins. We have 40 acres total as a family.

Me, as a third generation, I haven’t even thought about what I would want to do if I ever inherited the land, but I would definitely want to have a greenhouse – a large one.

Yeah, but basically my family strongly opposes P-12. And I would like to thank everyone. Thanks.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Wetcher, please, and then finally Kathleen Lorence-Flanagan would be next.

Unidentified female voice in the audience: (unintelligible)

Chair Raschko: These would be the last two if they're here.

Brian Wetcher: My name's Brian Wetcher, 814 26<sup>th</sup> Street, and I'm the Vice-President of Evergreen Islands and I've lived on Fidalgo Island since 1976. As such, since the early 1980s I've been involved in both Growth Management development and implementation on the statewide and a local level. And I would sympathize with many of the property owners in this room, because since the early 1990s when GMA became the law of the state of Washington this county has failed to implement a proper planning process for South Fidalgo. And that's 30 years. The settlement agreement to create a subarea plan for South Fidalgo – with the County between Evergreen Islands and the County, as directed by the judge – is a decade old. All of these people participated in a lot of processes to try and get to this point.

Now I favor Option 4 because I believe that it is the most compliant and the only way you can comply at this point with Growth Management. Option 1 does not comply with Growth Management, and I would point out to many of the folks in the room that a lot of the reason that some of the island has been preserved has been through actions by advocacy organizations like Evergreen Islands, including this is no condominiums on Heart Lake; there is no nuclear plant on Kiket Island; there is no waterslide at Campbell Lake, with a commercial development. And I assume, as we go through the points on Option 4, I would point out that – and where am I going here, Tom? – I would look to the slide above you, Skagit PUD service, as well as the service area for the island, and I would point out that that is the only areas where water is actually supplied by public water. And, therefore, I believe that the CaRD is probably reasonable – the CaRD request and requirement that they be on public water. I would also point out the City of Anacortes extension service – that small blue line there, the very small blue line at Campbell Lake and fire hydrant. And I would like to point out this last slide here. The – what we've already mentioned – the *Evergreen Islands vs. Skagit County, W* – I'll not burden you with that. But the proposal for lot coverage limitation, I believe, in all due respect to the Samish as being the –

(sound of timer)

Mr. Wetcher: – prior possessors of the land, we would like to have that as a 33,000 square foot

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Mr. Wetcher: – limitation. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Ms. Lorence-Flanagan?

Kathleen Lorence-Flanagan: I'm Kathleen Lorence-Flanagan. I live at 2005 10<sup>th</sup> Street in Anacortes. It's late. I'll keep this brief and I've just had eye surgery so that'll really make it brief. Mostly I just want to express strong support for P-12, Option 4, with elimination of unlimited lot

coverage for major public uses. Unlimited building size is counter to the rural character of South Fidalgo, and with all the questions about the aquifer it seems prudent to err on the side of caution.

On a positive note, I think the elimination of the inappropriate special uses is a good one. And that's it. Thank you very much for hearing all of us.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: Is there anybody else who would like to speak? Yes, sir?

George Wolner: My name is George Wolner. I live nine miles north of Sedro-Woolley. I have 17 acres in the Samish River. I don't have a water problem. I have a government problem. The problem with government, as I see it, and I've lived in north of Sedro-Woolley since 1976. I lived in Minnesota and Alaska. Beautiful country. This is a beautiful country.

What's this got to do with anything? Well, folks, if you have to tie in to public water and you haven't needed it before that's a huge expense. What does government do? It adds more expense to all of our lives in the private sector. Does that make any difference? Absolutely. It shuts down dreams. It limits individual entrepreneurship. It makes everybody dependent – more dependent on government, not encouraging you to be independent. That's not what we need in this country. We need people to get out and be innovative.

This proposal, P-12, recommends that nothing gets changed, gets regulated, and confines you to certain action and limits you and your life and your children's life. I'm opposed to P-12 for that reason and I vote for – I'm for Option number 1, and let people determine their own lives and work as a community with their neighbors and not just arbitrarily use government to beat them over the head. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

(applause)

Chair Raschko: You've spoken already?

Unidentified female voice at the microphone: Yes.

Chair Raschko: All right. This is not a debate, so...I want to thank everybody for coming and their interest. I think there were some very good points made and it's going to be a difficult task for the Planning Commission and the Planning Commissioners after that, too, to assemble all of this and try to come up with what would be truly the best thing to do. So I thank you very much, and that will conclude the public hearing.

Ms. Pratschner: ... interrupt. Did we open up the comment period for item C-19, the OSRSI map amendment?

Chair Raschko: Well, if we – we didn't have a sign-up sheet for that. We went through the sign-up sheets.

Ms. Pratschner: Oh, okay.

Chair Raschko: Which one is it?

Ms. Pratschner: It's item C-19, the proposal for the OSRSI map amendment.

Chair Raschko: Could I have attention please? Attention, please? There was no sign-up for C-19. If anybody wishes to speak to that issue, you have an opportunity. If not, thank you. So we'll continue. C-19. Okay, thank you.

Everybody is welcome to stay for the rest of the meeting. If not, kindly have your conversations in the lobby and we will move on to the Department Update.

Ms. Pratschner: Would the Planning Commission like to make a motion to close the public hearing?

Commissioner Mitchell: It's been closed.

Chair Raschko: Oh, do we need to do that? No, I declared it shut. Is there a –

Commissioner Hollie Del Vecchio: So moved.

Commissioner Mitchell: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing. All those in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Ms. Pratschner: Thank you. Yes, Department Update. Thank you. The next step in the process now that the public hearing portion is closed is that the public comment period will go to August 31<sup>st</sup>, and then we will want to schedule deliberations with the Planning Commission so that the Planning Commission may produce findings of fact and then produce a recorded motion for the Board of County Commissioners' review. So I was hoping to discuss with the Planning Commission a date to do that. I was envisioning a date in early October, something that would work, I know, with different schedules with folks in the office and the Planning Commission. Would something like that be amenable to the Commission?

(several sounds of assent)

Commissioner Lohman: We all nodded our heads.

Commissioner Mark Lundsten: Mr. Chairman. Stacie?

Ms. Pratschner: Yes?

Commissioner Lundsten: So we would bring this up, we would all these materials by August – shortly after August 31<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Pratschner: Correct.

Commissioner Lundsten: We will have September to consider them. Early October, first meeting in October we were planning to deliberate on the docket?

Ms. Pratschner: That's correct, Commissioner.

Commissioner Lundsten: Just to be clear. Thank you.

Ms. Pratschner: Yes. Yes, thank you. All right, then in the spirit of staying busy, the Planning Department on the –

Commissioner Lundsten: The spirit of staying busy?

Ms. Pratschner: – the 2018 – it's not even nine o'clock yet! – the 2018 and 2019 legislative work program, one of our items that we wanted to do by the end of the year – which we need to do by the end of the year, is some Ecology-mandated updates to our flood management chapter. We would like to hold a workshop with the Planning Commission to discuss these updates. I believe these updates were originally worked on by staff in 2016, according to the research I did. I've reached out to Ecology to get their comment. Would the Planning Commission be amenable to a workshop to discuss this in the second meeting in September – late September?

Chair Raschko: What would that date be?

Ms. Pratschner: I'm going to grab my phone so I can look at my calendar. It would be September 18<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Raschko: Do you want a – and you want a decision now?

Ms. Pratschner: No, I don't need the decision now. I just wanted to make sure that I brought it to the Planning Commission's attention.

Chair Raschko: All right.

Commissioner Mitchell: I think I like the idea of the workshop.

Chair Raschko: I do.

Commissioner Amy Hughes: You're talking about dates that we normally do, right?

Ms. Pratschner: Yes.

Commissioner Hughes: So we're just kind of getting back into a groove.

Ms. Pratschner: Yeah, exactly. With the end of the year coming, we'll have the docket. There'll be the capital facilities updates, and so just trying to plan ahead a little bit with the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Lohman: Mr. Chair?

Chair Raschko: Yes?

Commissioner Lohman: So Stacie, would you – when's the capital facilities and the transportation thing coming then?

Ms. Pratschner: The Capital Facilities Plan hearing with the Planning Commission should be scheduled about the last time it was scheduled last year, so the second meeting in October.

Chair Raschko: Okay, anything else?

Ms. Pratschner: I think that's all I can think of for Department Updates right now.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Ms. Pratschner: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Is there anything else for Stacie?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: If not, we'll go to the Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements. Has any – yes?

Commissioner Candler: I just want to take the opportunity – most people have gone but there are still a few people here. I just *really* want to thank everyone who came out for this public hearing portion of the hearing tonight. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: I think we would all probably second that.

Ms. Pratschner: Yes. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Anybody else?

Commissioner Candler: Move to adjourn?

Commissioner Del Vecchio: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn. All those in favor, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: The meeting's adjourned. Thank you.