

**Skagit County Planning Commission
Workshop: 2019 Docket Update
June 4, 2019**

Planning

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

Staff: **Hal Hart, Planning Director**
 Michael Cerbone, Senior Planner

Chair Tim Raschko: Welcome (gavel). Good evening. I'd like to call this June 4th, 2019 meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission to order. Has anybody any proposed revisions to the agenda?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: No? Okay. So our first agenda item will be an introduction to the long-range planner team supervisor, Michael Cerbone. Is that correct? Great.

Hal Hart: Great. Well, I'm pleased to be here. I'm Hal Hart, the Planning Director, and next to me is Michael Cerbone, our new long-range planning manager and supervisor of that program. He comes to us – really interesting background, I think just right for this community. He has a natural resource background in forestry, which is, you know, one of the components of Skagit County's history here. He has worked in such large burgs as Turner Maupin – am I saying that right?

Michael Cerbone: Maupin's right. Yep, yep.

Mr. Hart: Gold Hill and Prineville. He became the assistant urban planning administrator in Salem, Oregon.

Mr. Cerbone: Which is actually a big city.

Mr. Hart: Yes, yes. We know! And then he worked in the private sector for WRG Design to manage complex entitlement projects, things that you might recognize as Target, Costco, CarMax, and Cabela's. So he's been on the other side and seen many jurisdictions and what the rules and regulations are all throughout the country. Is that right?

Mr. Cerbone: Mostly western U.S.

Mr. Hart: Okay, good. And so I find that fascinating and really helpful when we write rules for the future. So his last eight years – is that right? How long has it been –

Mr. Cerbone: I was there three-and-a-half.

Mr. Hart: Three-and-a-half years at Multnomah County, so the big county in Oregon where Portland exists. So with that, I'm just pleased that he's here supporting us, and we're going to kickstart our process for the year and talk about the docket this evening. But let's do some introductions, I'm hoping.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, first of all, do you go by "Michael" or "Mike"?

Mr. Cerbone: Either one is fine with me. "Mike" is probably appropriate unless you're angry with me.

Chair Raschko: And where did you get your forestry degree?

Mr. Cerbone: Go Beavers! Oregon State.

Chair Raschko: Okay. I thought it'd be a good idea if we all introduced ourselves, and I can go first.

Mr. Cerbone: Yes.

Chair Raschko: I'm a forestry grad from the University of Washington and retired now but I spent 42 years in private industry. And I've been on this commission – what? I think three years. So, Amy?

Amy Hughes: I'm Amy Hughes and we farm in the Fir Island area and around Skagit County.

Annie Lohman: And I'm Annie Lohman. I'm also a farmer over by the Edison area.

Kathy Mitchell: I'm Kathy Mitchell, rural – right on the forest fringe.

Josh Axthelm: I'm Josh Axthelm. I'm down on Dike Road – an architect.

Mr. Cerbone: Okay.

Mark Lundsten: My name is Mark Lundsten. I live in the rural area of Fidalgo Island.

Mr. Cerbone: I was just out there last night.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. So we'll move on to – since we have no public, we'll skip the Public Remarks and move on to the Workshop: Docket Update and Discussion.

Mr. Cerbone: So I know you guys have seen a fair amount of this before, right? Because really what I'm going to do – he's going to kickstart me – I'm just going to go over the docket items. And I know you guys have seen them and you've talked about them. I've spent – you know, I've been here for about three weeks so I've spent that time reviewing the docket items. I know we're a little bit behind as far as the time goes, and so what I just want to do is go through them with you. If you guys have specific concerns I'd like to hear them so I can make sure that I'm hitting the right

mark when I come back for work sessions for all these different items. And then I'm going to share with you – is there a button I have to push to turn on? Okay. All right. And then all I wanted to do was essentially let you know what my plans are for getting us moving. And it's not going to be tackling the most complicated issues on the docket. I want to start with some of the more simpler ones and get those out of the way before we take on some of those larger ones. And the primary reason for that is I have to bring myself up to speed on what those issues are, how the County works – you know, what the political realities I'm operating in. All of those good things to be able to make sure that, you know, I'm doing the best I can for you guys.

I'm real excited to work with you. I like planning. I like planning on the west coast. I'm from the east coast. I like the west coast because it's transparent. And so I'm going to do my best to foster the most transparent process with you to make sure that people are aware of what's going on and what the facts are and everything. So that's where I come from and that's what I'm going to be trying to do with you.

So just to go over, you know, the docket: We've got P-1, P-2, and P-4 because one of those items was pulled and deferred. And I'll go into all of these in detail. We have one community-initiated Comprehensive Plan zoning map amendment to remove an MRO (Minerals Resource Overlay), and then we have eight County-initiated proposals. And like I said, I'm going to try and focus on those County-initiated proposals first because some of them, I think, are fairly straightforward and I think we can discuss them, we can go over them, put them aside, and work through those as I'm getting my feet under me on P-1 through 4.

So the policy code amendments are Rainwater Catchment for Guemes; Wells on Guemes Island; Small Cell Technology. That's the one that was deferred to the work program. And then there's a proposal for additional protections for Great Blue Herons.

Rainwater Catchment. So what I've done so far: My understanding of the rainwater catchment program is they desire to streamline and simplify the rainwater catchment entitlement process. So they're looking for ways to make it easier to, you know, permit rainwater catchment systems so that in hopes folks will pursue that methodology. I met with members of the Guemes Island Planning Advisory Commission yesterday just to get a basic understanding of, you know, what their concerns are and what their history is. Because reading through all the information on our record I saw there was a long history, so I did – they did reach out to me. I'm not sure how they found out I was here already, but I did meet with them and get some basic information from them to kind of get me oriented. I am researching similar permitting programs at other jurisdictions. They identified San Juan County. We're looking deeper, so we're going to go look and see what else other folks have been doing in their rainwater catchment.

Sure?

Commissioner Lohman: Are you specifically only looking at Guemes, or are you potentially looking for adoption for other areas of the county as well?

Mr. Cerbone: Well, you know, I think that's probably up for a recommendation from this body. I'm looking at it from what it was proposed and it was proposed specifically for Guemes, but I think that is something that we'll talk about and I think when we get deeper into the project we'll have that conversation. Because ultimately it's your – you, as a board, is going to make a recommendation. I'm going to research things, I'm going to bring you facts, and I'm going to help you work through that information so you can get to a point where you can make a recommendation to the Board. But I'm not going to tell you – especially given how much I've read

on the subject – what you should do, especially right now. I'll at least give you my opinion if you ask for it. I'll try not to offer it if it's not asked for.

So I also want to analyze the existing permit program that we have here. Just through the conversations that I had it sounded like there was potentially just some frustration with the bureaucracy that folks deal with when they come in for a permit. And so I think that warrants a closer look at what we're doing here. Sometimes it's good to change the code or a Comp Plan policy to provide direction; sometimes, you know, some things can be done through the administrative process as well, without doing that. So that's something I'm going to be doing for the rainwater catchment.

Any specific feedback or comments as I kind of dig deeper on these?

(silence)

Mr. Cerbone: Okay. Wells on Guemes Island. There's a desire to establish a County process to review wells before they're approved by the State. And so that would be – the mechanism I'm familiar with is wellhead protection overlay, but essentially putting a layer of review in at the County level prior to people being able to drill wells on Guemes Island. And, again, I met with those folks from the Guemes Island Planning Advisory Commission. We are again looking at researching similar permitting programs at other jurisdictions and digging into the State process more so I understand that better, and how this type of program could fit into that process or may be complicated by the State process. So I'll work closely with our attorney to research that information. The way these were described by the applicants is their belief is that they kind of work together to solve some of the potable water issues on Guemes Island. So that was the feedback that was provided.

So P-4, Great Blue Herons. This is a desire to establish zoning protections for Pacific blue heron sites in the county. These are large, rookery nesting sites with several birds – some over 100. And this was the Skagit Land Trust so I have reached out to them to set up a meeting to sit down and discuss that and get up to speed more on that. I'm also going to set up a meeting with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife because a lot of the proposal is predicated on work that the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife had done in the area. So I did want to actually touch base with them as well. I especially want to, you know, reach out to the State in the event, as we go through and discuss this more as a board – you know, if you want some of that expert testimony or you want some opinion from the folks at the State, I'll have that avenue and that ability to bring them in for you.

So this one I've started reading – I've read more on the other two Guemes issues because they did reach out to me for a meeting. I'm still, you know, nighttime-reading on this one. So it is a fair amount of information to catch up on and read and understand, and so I will also probably after I get my feet a little wetter look and see if there's other jurisdictions that have similar protections or have implemented similar programs. I always like to start with another jurisdiction, so if there's a specific jurisdiction that you guys do or don't like, that's helpful for you to get back to me. But I like to start with another jurisdiction so I'm not recreating the wheel. And oftentimes they've worked through legal issues and so, you know, we could take what they've done – it doesn't mean we need to adopt it the way they've done it, but we can take that as the basis for our discussion and modify it as appropriate for the community.

Chair Raschko: Excuse me. Have these areas been mapped yet?

Mr. Cerbone: My understanding is they are. Because what I read through they describe them specifically. One is on March Point. One is at another state park that is actually up towards Edison. And the other one I want to say is closer into Mount Vernon, kind of in between Mount Vernon, Sedro, and Burlington. So I think they're known areas. I didn't actually look and put my eyes on a map but through reading through the documents I was able to understand where they were, because I had been out to Fidalgo and drove by March Point, so when that came up I was like, Oh, okay, I actually know where that is. But, yeah, what we'll do when we start getting into some of these larger work plan items is we'll probably have an initial work session where I'll report to you everything that I've done in research on that, and if you want additional information I will go back and find that. I look at my role here as really serving to find the answers to the questions that you have. So if you communicate them to me I will do my best to go search out, find that answer, and either bring it back to you or bring a credible individual back to communicate that to you.

So this was a citizen-initiated Comprehensive Plan Zoning Map amendment. This is for the removal of an MRO designation for about a nine-acre plat owned by Mangat Estates. The MRO designation is a Mineral Resource Overlay. It's intended as a protection overlay for extractive industry, so it's placed on property – it prohibits future subdivision of that property, and so that is the reason why they're seeking to remove it. On their original piece of property they had development rights for 18 dwelling units. They've platted nine of those and they would like to remove this designation and then plat the other nine on the piece of property that's designated MRO. And I'm going to set up a meeting with the applicant. I have not done that yet. And I have chatted internally with staff about the amendments to better understand how they are and how they work with the code.

There's apparently a provision in the land division ordinance which precludes properties with an MRO designation from being divided, and so that's why they're seeking to remove it. And my understanding from reading their application is they believe that, twofold, there was possibly an error in applying that designation to the property, and then also they do not believe that there are the resources that are sought on that property.

So these are the ones I'm going to try and focus on first because I think I've already got some packaged up and ready to bring and have discussion with you guys. And I do want to start – again, I realize I'm about three months behind on the docket agenda and I want to make sure we get through it.

So the Guemes Island Ferry is pretty straightforward. It's amending numbers within the Comp Plan. And so these are numbers that identify the project costs, a summary, and then identify revenue sources and additional revenue for purchasing the ferry. I'm going to coordinate with Mr. – Dan, the Public Works director, and the County engineer. I think this is a pretty straightforward one unless there's concerns about what's going on with the ferry. Once I get this information I'm probably going to bring it before you because I think it is – it is relatively straightforward. It's updating projections for costs for acquiring the ferry.

So codifying Comp Plan Policy 4A-5.6. This is collaborating with the drainage districts to develop code language authorizing their review and comment on development applications. So this will be similar – we have provisions in the code right now to require _____ with the Port of Skagit, and so this would be similar to that but giving that same approval or allowance to the drainage districts so when there's a project within their actual district they would have the ability to comment on it.

So I have reached out to the Skagit County Drainage Consortium, I believe is the name, and so that's the first stop, I thought, since they know all the folks at the different drainage districts. And so I'll reach out to them and start chatting with them more. This does appear to be relatively straightforward but I do want to make sure before I bring it before you that all the parties that are affected by it agree with that assessment.

Binding Site Plans at the Port of Skagit. So this is a request that I have been working with our current Planning folks on. It's a consideration of revising the code to remove the requirement that a binding site plan be required when you have a commercial or industrial property that has two or more leases. And so I am still doing some more research on this. I do want to make sure that whatever we're doing is consistent with State law and I do want to make sure that it serves the purpose of what's sought. This is one that probably *won't* come before you, you know, very quickly because I do want to make sure (we're) crossing all the t's and dotting the i's.

Trails in the OSRSI. So this is considering the modification of the code to allow trails to be developed as an outright permitted use in the OSRSI and to require an administrative special use permit to entitle trailheads. So right now I believe it's identified as an administrative special use permit for everything involved, and so you'd be breaking a piece of that out and allowing that as an outright use for the development of trails, and then if a trailhead would – a trailhead essentially has, you know, facilities like a parking area, bathroom, things like that. That would still be an administrative special use permit. I did schedule a meeting with Skagit County Parks and Rec and I'm meeting with them tomorrow, so I'll chat with them in more detail about that and make a decision about how we prioritize this and bring this before (you). This, again, does appear to be pretty straightforward but I do want to chat and make sure I understand everything before I bring it before you.

Chair Raschko: Could I ask a question, please?

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah, of course.

Chair Raschko: So trails would be an outright permitted use.

Mr. Cerbone: Mm-hmm.

Chair Raschko: So requiring an administrative special use permit for the trailhead, though. Is that only if the trailhead is developed with parking and toilets and all that?

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah.

Chair Raschko: So if it just bumps onto a road then there's no special use permit?

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah. Yeah, so if you have the trail running like this across and you have your trailhead here, and this trail maybe runs through, like, 15 properties, that would be an outright permitted use on those properties. It would still be subject to whatever portions of the code still have to be applied – the stormwater, creating erosion control, things like that. But the actual land use permit that would require notice and all that – the administrative special use – would just be focused on the piece that had the parking lot and, you know, the more development-type facilities.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Mr. Cerbone: That's my understanding, but I'm going to make sure that I know that for sure before I bring it back.

This one also does appear to be pretty straightforward: So this is considering allowing habitat restoration as a Hearings Examiner special use permit in all zones. Right now habitat restoration is called out as a Hearings Examiner special use permit in the Ag-NRL zone and it's not specifically called out anywhere else. And so the thought was that potentially that occurred because there was a desire to have habitat restoration to be allowed within that zone, but what that's created is now if it's not listed in the other zones they don't believe that they can do that type of work in the other zones. So again, that seems fairly straightforward to me. Some of the questions I have on this is: Is it appropriate for it to be a Hearings Examiner special use permit for *all* the zones, or can maybe that be an administrative special use in some of the other zones? But that's something for you guys to chew on. That's the initial thought I had on that. My goal is always to try and push down decisions to the lowest level possible because that's going to allow that permit to get processed in a quicker, more efficient manner. Certainly when there's things that have a lot of discretion, that require a public hearing, that require a Hearings Examiner, it's appropriate to have them there, but it's not always appropriate to have that level of decision. It's up to you guys to make that decision for how that's going to be classified. But that's probably the one question I'm going to bring you on this, is: Is it appropriate to have it at this level for all zones? I would assume it would be appropriate to allow habitat restoration in all zones. I'm onboard with that. Hopefully you guys are. But figuring out what that process is and what the applicants are going to have to go through to do that type of work, I think that's probably what we'll wind up talking about.

Commissioner Lohman: Excuse me.

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah?

Commissioner Lohman: To clarify: You said the Ag-NRL, right?

Mr. Cerbone: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Lohman: Okay.

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah.

So Fire Code Consistency with the IFC – is everybody familiar with IFC? It's International Fire Codes. It's – a lot of jurisdictions in the US and throughout the world use the International Fire Code, and that's how they govern how development occurs in their communities. And the County has adopted the International Fire Code and several of the appendices – not *all* of the appendices but several of them. And what they've done is instead of adopting the entire code, in some instances they've gone through and they've said, Well, we want a different standard for this specific part of the IFC, and so they've adopted exceptions to that. And so what we're proposing to do is go through and amend some of those exceptions. And one example that I can give you is there's a – the code identifies a 70-foot minimum radius for a turnaround. It's 96 feet is what it's supposed to be, and so that's what it says in the IFC and that's what the fire marshal is requiring. And so that's just one example. And then there were some other restrictions in there that we discussed and thought were appropriate to propose to be removed because the intent of the IFC the way it works is it sets out a threshold for what you need to do to do development but it's not stringent. It's not locked in place. So it has flexibility to be able to address specific situations. And so some of the proposed amendments in this package are going to be addressing providing more

flexibility to the fire marshal as they review things. An example of what I just talked about is 12% is the slope for driveways for most new homes. But typically you can go beyond that 12% if you do specific things. You know, you sprinkle the home, you do some different types of designs with the home, different types of materials. The fire marshal will have more flexibility and allow you to go to a higher slope – things like that.

This one, I think, is pretty straightforward. I met with one of the fire marshals today. We reviewed everything. She's very comfortable with where it is. And so this is probably one of the ones I'm going to bring before you first.

So Building Permits for Signs. Consider modifying code language regarding when a building permit is required. So right now we have specific language in the code that alludes to when a building permit – it doesn't *allude*; it actually *says* when a building permit is required, and in some instances a building permit's not really required. So it draws a distinction between how tall the sign is and how wide the sign is and how many square feet are on the sign, and the real distinction for when a building permit's required for a sign is, you know, Is there wind load? So is it a projecting sign? Is it coming off the building? That's going to require a building permit. But if you're placing a sign and you're bolting it onto the side of the building, it doesn't necessarily require a building permit unless we want it. But the way the code is written is it moves these people back, thinking they need to come in and get a building permit. So what we want to do is clarify the specific exceptions for when that permit is required or not required so that folks, when they're reading the code, kind of have that understanding.

My other general approach to writing code is to have a clear and objective path, because I think planning works best when we all read the same thing and understand what it says, and then a discretionary path, because not everything can fit nicely into a box. That discretionary path usually will have standards to kind of match the community values to make sure that things are being approved by a Hearings Examiner and administrative staff decision – you know, match the intent of the community even though it deviates from that strict clear and objective standard. That's how I like to deal with code because I know having a box doesn't always work. Most projects – and I know Josh probably can agree with this; he's an architect – most projects don't fit in a box, neatly, at least. A little flexibility's not bad as long as we're getting what we need at the end of the day.

So that is one that I'll be bringing sooner rather than later, but not to the next meeting but pretty soon, I'm thinking.

And then the last one was modifying the Airport Environs Overlay. Consider amendments to the Airport Environs Overlay code to address the need to consult with the Port as part of the development review process.

And so this is specific. They had written a letter to us and there were two specific requests that they had. One was when there is an adjustment to the height or a variance to the height within the approach zones – so the approach zones are on either end of the runway and they're a three-dimensional surface that, you know, tries to limit and clear the approach area where the aircraft are coming in and leaving the airport. So height restrictions, restrictions on things that can be built there, requiring red lights – reflection lights on top of things. So they've requested that when there is a change to that height restriction that's in the code, if they use that discretion that they be looped in and their thoughts considered as part of that process. And then along the same lines, they currently already have provisions in the code that allow them to get notice and comment on proposals for specific land use applications, and they've requested to add a property line adjustment as another one of those types of applications. And the code is very clear that they

have the ability to participate and provide comments, but that the County doesn't necessarily need to act on those comments. They just need to provide the ability for those to be considered.

And so this is one I'm probably going to bring before you relatively soon. Like I said, I did reach out to them. I do want to just confirm and make sure my reading and understanding of what they want to do is correct, but that's how I understand that proposal. It appeared pretty straightforward.

So this is what I'm thinking for us moving forward. June 18th: Since you guys will have so much time away to yourselves, I was thinking we would come back here. I would have some actual materials for us to look at. My understanding is you guys like to see that about a week in advance. Does that sound right? And you're all okay with email?

Female Commissioner: Yes.

Mr. Cerbone: Okay, great. So that is what I will shoot for. I was hoping to have a work session on the Airport Environs Overlay so I think we're there. I think I'm going to be able to get that down in the next week. And then updating the access standards for the vehicle access road – the IFC – the fire code improvements, which I know I'm already there on. So that's what I was hoping for June 18th. I was thinking those were manageable. In the event that they're not both manageable on that evening, we can take one on and, you know, at the point where you guys typically want to break for the evening, that's up to you. And we can put it onto the next agenda and go that way. But I think until I see kind of how we're going to work together and move through these things I'm going to try and make sure that I'm not wasting your time so I have enough stuff on the agenda that we can actually get some work done. But it depends on how many questions you ask, how many concerns you have, whether I did a good enough job presenting the information and compiling it for you. But does that sound fair for June 18th?

(sounds of assent from several Planning Commissioners)

Mr. Cerbone: Okay. So July 2nd: I've got three question marks next to that because that's pretty close to a holiday. Do you want to push it out?

Ms. Hughes: One week maybe?

Mr. Cerbone: It's perfectly fine. I literally put this together because I felt the sense of urgency. Because there was such a break, I wanted to start moving things through. But at the same time, we all have families, loved ones, and lives.

Commissioner Lundsten: The July 2nd date was the one that we were all planning on, right?

Commissioner Axthelm: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Lundsten: That was what Kathy sent out to us, I believe. So I haven't – it's on my calendar.

Mr. Cerbone: It's on your calendar?

Commissioner Lundsten: So I for one have no objection. I was planning on it.

Commissioner Hughes: We usually go the first and the third, right?

Commissioner Lundsten: Yeah.

Commissioner Axthelm: And that's before the holiday so that's fine.

Mr. Cerbone: Okay. All right.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Mr. Cerbone: Well, then I'll take those off. And so at that one I was planning on doing the building permits for the signs? I should be there. And then the Habitat Restoration as the HE Special Use, so I'll have a better understanding of what that is. And some of these, I think, you know, we'll be able to have a conversation and I think you'll be pretty comfortable with them and we can kind of set that aside. Others you're going to have more questions and I'm going to go back and I'm going to research it and bring that information back to you. But I am trying to frontload ones that I think are relatively straightforward so that we can start working through them. The process here at Skagit County's new to me for legislative so I – you know, I'm certainly open to any feedback you have. If you like things that were done a special way I'll certainly try and do that. You just need to let me know. But I'm going to approach it the same way that I've done legislative work elsewhere which is, again, trying to foster a transparent process and making sure that your questions are answered and I'm getting you the right information, because I don't look at this as *my* work program. It's yours, and it's ultimately the elected officials who make the decisions. So I need to get you the facts, I need to get you the information, and help you get through that, but ultimately you as a board need to make a recommendation. And so that's how I see my role.

And then July 16th I've got a Comp Plan policy.

Chair Raschko: Kathy?

Vice Chair Mitchell: Okay. I was going to say just a simple thing that you probably already expect. For most of us, the sooner we can see information the better.

Mr. Cerbone: Okay.

Vice Chair Mitchell: It's always helpful because sometimes it takes a deep dive if you're not familiar.

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah. So I don't know what you've seen.

Vice Chair Mitchell: Right.

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah. So what have you seen other than some PowerPoints?

Vice Chair Mitchell: On these?

Mr. Cerbone: On any of these.

Vice Chair Mitchell: I guess nothing.

Mr. Cerbone: Nothing. Okay.

Commissioner Lundsten: Unless we've come to a docket – a hearing that's in front of the Board. We haven't had a meeting since January.

Mr. Cerbone: Okay. Okay. So have you seen the docketing material at least? The summaries? Okay, I'll get those to you. Yeah, I mean I think that's – that's a – you know, have you seen the resolution?

(silence)

Mr. Cerbone: Okay. So I will get you the docketing materials and the resolution. I think that's where I started. Certainly I have the full applications, but I don't want to inundate you. What I'll do is I can get you that information. That's the Reader's Digest version. It'll give you a good feeling for what's there. And then as we start moving closer to some of the projects that have more information attached to them, what I'll do is I'll start pulling together documents to send you. Yeah?

Vice Chair Mitchell: What has worked well in the past – I'm not real familiar with how you've done it other places, but not just for us but for the public because there's quite a few of the public that follow along – so almost as soon as you can get it to us if it can go in a link up onto the website for where anybody can go look and see and start studying.

Mr. Cerbone: Okay.

Vice Chair Mitchell: Because a *lot* of our public does that as well.

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah, for my past position when I did a legislative project, yeah, we would list everything on a project website for legislative work, and I can work with Brian to do that.

Vice Chair Mitchell: Super. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Is that it?

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah.

Chair Raschko: Are there any other questions or comments?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: I'd just like a short comment that I appreciate your approach to this as far as the openness goes. And it sounds very collaborative and respectful. I appreciate that.

Mr. Cerbone: Well, thank you. Well, I'm going to let Hal pick up the rest.

Mr. Hart: Right. So for – through the Chair, we're ready to go to Department Updates. I just have a few quick ones. The first one I want to draw attention to is – it's on the website. I don't know how many have seen that, but it's under "Popular Topics," I think, and it's – we put together an annual report. It really took a couple of months to put that together and so it was about February, I think, when we finally got it out there. And so you may not have. It's on there. It's just an accounting of a lot of things that we did with some mapping. And I'm a believer that once you do a comprehensive plan you need to keep informing the community how you're doing on getting that – you know, How are you doing towards your comprehensive plan? The chief way – there are a number of ways. You know, capital facilities investment, investments in housing, all those

things are significant and we need to report those, but really it's the permit process of the thousands of people and corporations and companies and those big and small Mom and Pop that are making investments every day. So our counter is just rocking and rolling these days and we're seeing lots of people come through as we do every year. And so that's the – the annual report kind of summarizes last year's information for you. We'll do one each year. And so that is on the website so I've not made the paper copy. You can just kind of click and go through it. I don't know if we really captured the right things that *you* would like, but *you're* my first sounding board. The Commissioners were okay with it, but really, you know, the more ideas the better. I just wanted to get it out there because I'm a big believer that there's a lot going on and we need to tell that story somehow. Where are people making those everyday investments in your community? So that's one item.

The next one is the Agricultural Board. They had asked me for some information and the information – and it's also up on the website – is commercial and residential permits received in 2018 in the Ag-NRL zoning designation. So we have that information and it's summarized in a tabular form. But we also did, working with our GIS Department – they're great guys – kind of *where* that's occurring. So I want to do more of the *where-is- it-occurring* on the landscape. Is that consistent with where we wanted that investment? What's the dollar value of that investment that's being made? And is it an agricultural investment? Is it a housing investment? What's being done on the Ag-NRL? They came back and said, Yeah, we want to know the square footage of ground that's being covered by something new. So we'll get them that information. And I think that's important information if the policy is (to) keep that on the next 30 generations – keep that as our growing place. So tracking that is important to them and, I think, to everybody in the community. So that's another one that's up.

This next one – could you pass that out? So this is – the next one I'm sending out isn't up yet but I need to put it up. And just a couple of weeks ago the Commissioners and I were engaged in the discussion of, Well, how much housing are we really doing and how have we been from year to year? So we have single-family residences. We have manufactured homes, accessory dwelling units, the total number received. And what was the total project valuation going there? Now you might remember that our Comprehensive Plan and our Countywide Planning Policy said, Hey, here's the deal in Skagit County. Twenty percent of the future growth goes to the unincorporated part but eighty percent is assigned to the cities. So how well are we doing? This is how we're doing but I don't have the eighty percent yet. So I'm working on trying to find that data for the same time so that we can see this – we can see what actually is occurring both economically and geographically around the county. So one thing that I'm always doing is I'm – because we hear that housing is a huge issue and homelessness is a huge issue, and people are keyed in on those issues, so knowing where those investments are going to be is or where they're coming is key. And if the Cities – the theory is if the Cities are doing their part then that perhaps will take some of the burden off of the County and the pressure off of the County to divide its land base up for the future. And so each time we look at natural resource permits – we have several gravel pits, we have a quarry, we have lots of things that come through, and it's those neighbors that have moved – a lot of neighbors have moved in around those long-term resource areas – and maybe they're ag areas – and the more you get people close to those extraction or – whether it's forestry or ag – then you get a lot of questions about forest practices or agricultural practices come up. Or we hear from the Ag Board saying, Yeah, I don't feel comfortable driving my tractor anymore because there's a line of cars that's, you know, 30 cars long when I'm trying to go from each of the farm fields that I'm going to. And so that really hits home with me in terms of how does the ag community – how are they impacted by these things?

So, anyway, so where we're putting people on landscape is a big deal and also the percentage. So we'll – as I get that, I'm going to put this on the website as well, and hopefully we'll have answers from the Cities, working cooperatively with them as well. So just some quick updates on that.

We are still on track to – let's talk about ag tourism study. So the ag tourism study is still something that we're going to do. I waited until he was here – until Michael – Mike – had joined our team and then we'll begin that process of reaching out to the stakeholders across the community now and really put some legs on what it is that we're going to go out there. We'll keep you in that loop as we bring it forward. This is going to be a transparent process but a really important process. And we are being told by lots of folks that ag tourism is kind of shifting. It's big and it's shifting more towards events and to larger events, and it's shifting to festivals and things like that. All those things can have – you know, they can have certain impacts on surrounding agricultural activities. And so, you know, how we look at that, how we coordinate with the Cities might be really important on that, and certainly it fits into the larger tourism discussion as well, too. So we plan to move forward with that effort and keep you in that loop along with the ag commission and lots of other stakeholders.

If that sounds okay then –

Vice Chair Mitchell: Thank you. Yeah.

Mr. Hart: Yeah. So, again, I am very, very excited to have our legislative person here who's got great experience and can help us move forward, and we'll take any questions right now. Yes?

Vice Chair Mitchell: One thing that we've not seen in a long time are the population numbers – how they've shifted. The last time we heard, I think, was Gary Christensen when he was here with some of the things and how things were coming along back then, so if – like to know how/if we're meeting projections, exceeding projections, under projections – that kind of thing.

Mr. Hart: Right. We can get that for you, and it's funny. I just had – that was on my – when I turned my computer on that was one of the layers I had on. I'm always looking at that. We should have an update –

Mr. Cerbone: One of the interns was looking into it because I was helping him find that information. I think it depends on where you look to see that projection as to whether you're matching it or not. I read the Coordinated Water System Plan for a proposed expansion up in Concrete and I could tell you that where we're at population-wise is below the lowest level of projection in that Coordinated Water System Plan. But I think depending on what portion of the Comp Plan or ancillary plans you look at, that could be a little different. But the interns were going to collect that information and look at the population growth and then try and look – I think at the cities, as well. That's part of what Hal was trying to do, is figure out, you know, how and where that growth was occurring.

Vice Chair Mitchell: That's helpful because I think it was – I'm going to say 2008, 2010. I could be wrong on those dates, but somewhere around then they thought that we were going to be meeting the higher ends of projections and then, you know, things cratered and it changed, and, quite frankly, we're not sure where we are.

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah, yeah. Well, we can tell you where we are.

Mr. Hart: So I think the last population number countywide was about 128, was the last one I've seen. So, you know, a really significant increase. Maybe not the growth that you're seeing in Snohomish County but it's all relative to – our plan is, you know, hopefully they're going to go – 80% of those will choose the cities. And I think that's where we keep our eye on things.

Mr. Cerbone: And then the other work plan item that we're probably going to focus on when we get the docket moving along is updates to the stormwater standards. And those were coming out of the revision to our NPDES permit. And so that is something I do want to get my hands around and bring before you sooner rather than later, as well. But there's lots of stuff on the work program. I can tell you that. Keep me busy for a while! So I certainly want to try and prioritize the things that are on fire and make sure we're addressing those first.

Commissioner Lohman: Mr. Chair?

Chair Raschko: Yes.

Commissioner Lohman: So we're going to do the land disturbance too? The stuff that we started and spent a lot of time with but we didn't finish? And then the Rural Forest Initiative, I think.

Chair Raschko: Those two got kind of wound together accidentally.

Commissioner Lohman: Yeah, they did. And then we also had the Latecomers.

Mr. Cerbone: Okay.

Vice Chair Mitchell: And the stormwaters – I mean, the Shoreline.

Mr. Hart: Yeah, Shorelines is still in process.

Mr. Cerbone: It's in process, yeah. I know Betsy was meeting with the consultant and discussing kind of the next steps on that. That was the first week I started.

Mr. Hart: The consultant is the Watershed Company on that, and so we'll be working with them. I haven't got a *new* report from Betsy on that but she would know that I'm always pushing – Hey, what's the latest update this week? So as soon as I hear something I will bring you an update.

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah, we'll make sure we have updates on all those that you just brought up by the next meeting. It may not be the update you want, but we'll make sure we have it.

Commissioner Lohman: Because I think some of us are going to need a refresher because we've had quite a long period of layoff.

(sounds of assent from Planning Commissioners and staff)

Mr. Hart: Yes, and staff recently went to some refreshers too so they can bring you the latest that they've learned. Either we'll bring the – our own staff team or we'll bring in experts that will tell us what counties are having to do.

Commissioner Lohman: Well, I was referring to the unfinished stuff.

Mr. Hart: Oh. Okay, no problem.

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah. I mean, it's –

Mr. Hart: We'll bring that back to you.

Mr. Cerbone: – going to be best for me, even if you guys were in process, to kind of start back in the process to make sure that we're going in the right direction. Because *you* may need a refresher; I need a *big* refresher because I haven't read it yet.

Mr. Hart: One last update. There's a lot of change going on in the County at the moment. So we have a new County administrator. And so Tim has – after many years – has retired as our County administrator and now Trisha, our finance director, is serving in that position. But she reminded me of the importance of working with the Planning Commission and our community and also deriving policy from the Planning Department. Hopefully we're linked to you and we're getting the community input that we need there.

Chair Raschko: Anything else?

Mr. Hart: No, that's it. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Well, thank you.

Mr. Hart: You bet.

Chair Raschko: So moving to the Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements. Has anybody an announcement?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: No? Comments?

Commissioner Lundsten: I'm glad that you have – that we have a new Planning director, and thank you for showing up.

Mr. Cerbone: Yeah. No, thanks for having me.

Commissioner Lundsten: And I second what Tim said earlier.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead.

Mr. Hart: One thing. If we are doing any sort of daytime training like sitting in a room and watching a video that might be relevant to the issue, would you like us to tell you? Because where I'm from, we would invite the planning commission to come in and learn that as staff is learning it. And so I would love to do that, and, you know, it'd be a lunchtime opportunity to pick up something. And I've seen different ones that might be important. Again, the County Commissioners are thinking about the importance of housing right now, but there's a whole variety of things. It could be shorelines, it could be housing, it could be – so as they come up, we'll message those to all of you.

Commissioner Lundsten: I appreciate that.

Chair Raschko: Well, my final comment would be just a welcome to Michael, and we look forward to working with you and appreciate what I'm hearing so far here today. So with no further business, I call the meeting adjourned (gavel).