

RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS  
SKAGIT COUNTY COMMISSIONERS'

Tuesday, August 18, 1992

- 9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. Department of Planning and Community Development - Scott Kirkpatrick, Director.
- 1) Signatures - Chuckanut Crest Golf Course EIS Consultant Services Agreement/Herrera Environmental Consultants.
  - 2) Code Enforcement Activity Report.
  - 3) Miscellaneous.
- 10:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m. Appeal - Preliminary Plat Application #PPT-90-002 of Kendall Gentry, 1570 Bennet Road, Mount Vernon.
- 11:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. Site Visit - Lot 49, Sulphur Springs Lake Tracts, Big Lake.
- 1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m. Public Hearing - Shoreline Substantial Development/Variance Permit #SLV-91-032 of Jerry Rindal -Lot 49, Sulfur Springs Lake Tracts, Big Lake.
- 7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Meeting Regarding Illegal Dumping.  
(Birdsview Grange, Russell Road, Birdsview).

The Skagit County Board of Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, August 18, 1992, with Commissioners Robby Robinson, Ruth Wylie, and W. W. Vaux present.

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - SCOTT KIRKPATRICK, DIRECTOR.**

- 1) Signatures - Chuckanut Crest Golf Course EIS Consultant Services Agreement/Herrera Environmental Consultants.

Mr. Kirkpatrick reviewed for the Board that the proposed golf course site is at the northeast portion of the intersection of Hobson and Colony Roads. The permit was applied for and after a review of the materials prepared by the applicant, it was determined that there could be two development options for the subject property. One would be the proposed golf course, the other would be to develop a residential community with a density of 1 home per 5 acre parcel totaling approximately 50 homes. The applicant has agreed to deposit \$2,500 with the County within 10 days of the execution of the agreement for the major development fee for the processing of the special use application and make addition deposits of \$2,500 to offset expenses when County costs exceed the initial deport. Any amount not used by the County will be refunded to the Applicant. The Applicant has also agreed to deposit \$14,002.34 within ten days of the execution of the Agreement with the County and pay the balance due in three monthly installments in the amount of \$7,000.00 per month for the Environmental Impact Statement reimbursement. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that there is no plan or alternate plan for a golf course and housing development combined.

The Agreement was signed. (Contract #01396).

- 2) Code Enforcement Activity Report.

The Code Enforcement Activity Report was presented to the Board.

3) Miscellaneous.

A discussion was held regarding the County's position on the prospect of March Point being annexed into the City of Anacortes. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that he had assured the refinery's attorney that the County would resist any move by the City to annex the Point. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that their attorney indicated that Texaco has no desire to leave the County. He will continue to keep the Board informed of any further conversations regarding this matter.

**APPEAL - PRELIMINARY PLAT APPLICATION #PPT-90-002 OF KENDALL GENTRY, 1570 BENNETT ROAD, MOUNT VERNON.**

Grace Roeder, Associate Planner, opened the discussion and gave information. Ms. Roeder referenced a memorandum from herself to the Board dated 07/15/92 and submitted earlier, containing a history of the plat application. She reviewed that on February 24, 1992, the Planning Department received a faxed letter from the applicant requesting a withdrawal of his application. This arrived after a verbal decision had been made on February 11 by the Hearing Examiner Pro Tem. Staff erred in that they believed that the oral decision made on February 11 was the final decision. In fact, the decision was not final until a written decision was transmitted some three weeks later on April 2, 1992. The Planning Department has conceded this error, and subsequent communications with legal counsel, John Moffat, reflect that an error did occur. Mr. Gentry, through his attorney, John Meyer, has appealed the hearing examiner's decision and has asked that the Board nullify the decision based upon his February 24 request for withdrawal.

Ms. Roeder reviewed with the Board their available options in an appeal. Those options are:

- 1) To deny the appeal.
- 2) To remand the matter back to the Hearing Examiner for review of specific concerns identified by the Board.
- 3) To hold their own public hearing to consider testimony and make an independent decision.

John Meyer, an attorney representing the applicant, Mr. Gentry, was given an opportunity to speak, and requested that not only the April 2 decision be vacated, but also that of 6/14/91, because the 6/14/91 decision was appealed and remanded, and was still in the process of review.

Commissioner Wylie verified that both shorelines and preliminary plat applications were reviewed together.

Ms. Roeder asked Stephanie Wood, Administrative Coordinator, to relate any information she received from John Moffat regarding the procedure to nullify the Hearing Examiner's decision.

Ms. Wood related that Mr. Moffat advised that a public hearing is not necessary to correct this error. The Board may remand the matter back to the Hearing Examiner with instructions to vacate his earlier decisions.

Commissioner Wylie then motioned to remand the matter back to the Hearing Examiner with the directions that he nullify both the original order dated 6/14/91 and the subsequent decision dated 4/2/92.

Commissioner Vaux verified that Mr. Gentry may reapply for a preliminary plat on this property at a later date. This was confirmed by both Ms. Roeder and Oscar Graham, Shorelines Administrator. Commissioner Vaux then seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**SITE VISIT - LOT 49, SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE TRACTS, BIG LAKE.**

The Board traveled to lot 49, Sulphur Springs Lake Tracts in Big Lake to make a site inspection of the Rindal property regarding Shoreline Permit request #SLV-91-032. No public comment was taken at the site.

**PUBLIC HEARING - SHORELINE SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT/VARIANCE PERMIT #SLV-91-032 OF JERRY RINDAL - LOT 49, SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE TRACTS, BIG LAKE.**

Chairman Robinson waived the reading of the notice of public hearing, as published in The Skagit Argus.

The Board had previously been provided with a supplemental staff report drafted by Zoe Pfahl, Assistant Shoreline Administrator, Skagit County Planning Department.

Appellants Joann Hanson and Frederic Dunlap, neighbors of Mr. Rindal's, were represented by Attorney Peter Eglick.

Ms. Pfahl supplied copies of a letter from Peter Eglick provided prior to the previous public meeting on this matter. The second item was a memorandum from Bob McGill, previous Assistant Shoreline Administrator, commenting on setback measurements he took on January 24, 1992. The third item was a plat map of the subject property. Maps were also provided showing the Rindal's building "envelope" on the property and the latest site plan provided by Mr. Rindal.

Ms. Pfahl read her supplemental staff report into the record. Mr. Rindal's proposal is to construct a 24 foot by 30 foot single family residence within the shoreline setback area on Big Lake. His original application, which was subsequently appealed by Ms. Hanson and Mr. Dunlap, required the coverage of his lot at greater than the 30% maximum allowed by the Shoreline Master Program. The staff report indicated that, since the appeal hearing and setting of this public hearing, Mr. Rindal has modified his application in the following manner:

- Instead of exceeding the 30% maximum lot coverage as proposed before, Mr. Rindal is now willing to remove the parking slab at the front portion of his lot, but leave the existing retaining wall. The removal of the parking slab will decrease the proposed lot coverage to 23.5%, which is within the requirements of the Shoreline Master Program.
- Sideyard setbacks and height limits would be complied with.
- Square footage of the residence would remain at 720 square feet.
- The residence will be built 49 feet landward from the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) instead of the required 50 feet. (Mr. Rindal's original proposal was 35 feet from the OHWM plus a deck for a total of 23 feet from the OHWM).
- To reach the 49 foot setback, Mr. Rindal will have to place his home within the required 25 foot front yard setback. He is proposing to construct it within 17 feet of Sulphur Springs Road.

Ms. Pfahl reviewed the criteria for approval of a Shorelines Variance Permit. She read the recommendation from the staff report indicating that staff would support the approval of the variance subject to conditions that:

- Applicant obtains all necessary permits and approvals.
- Applicant shall apply for a zoning variance to build within the 25 foot front yard setback.

- Applicant shall maintain a shoreline setback of 49 feet landward from the OHWM.
- Applicant shall revegetate any vegetation disturbed during construction.
- Development shall remain consistent with Shoreline Master Program and other shoreline acts.

Chairman Robinson invited Mr. Rindal to speak first. Mr. Rindal declined, supporting the information stated by Ms. Pfahl.

Commissioner Wylie confirmed that the variance request is for 49 feet.

Peter Eglick, Suite 1212 Bank of California Building, Seattle, WA, spoke next. His clients, he indicated, are opposed to any variance within the shoreline area near their property. Mr. Eglick maintained that using the average of local residence setback, staff has found that an average of 35 feet is the current setback for nearby residences. Mr. Eglick maintained that in such cases, the Shoreline Master Plan indicates that where averages are less than 50 feet, 50 feet shall be used.

Mr. Eglick stated that his clients wish to have a decision from the Board that cannot later be challenged because it is unclear or ambiguous. He complimented staff on an excellent staff report. He did; however, provide to the Board a document entitled "Appellant's Proposed Findings and Decision", which included suggested revisions of staff findings.

Findings #6 and #7 of the staff report were challenged and changes suggested. Finding #7 related to the OHWM, and Mr. Eglick wished to suggest that a surveyor be engaged to establish benchmarks for the OHWM. Mr. Eglick stated that his previous letter dated July 8, 1992, and introduced by Ms. Pfahl, offered his clients' participation in the costs of a surveyor. Findings #9 and #11 were also clarified. Mr. Eglick stated that the Hearing Examiner's decision allowed Mr. Rindal to aggregate his holdings that are separated by Sulphur Springs Road. He suggested #11 be changed to show that subsequent legal consultation has indicated that this is not possible. Minor changes were also suggested for #14 and #15. It was suggested that #16, which identifies that other setback and lot coverage variances in the immediate vicinity have been approved, be modified.

Regarding the Planning Department staff's recommendation, Mr. Eglick felt that Mr. Rindal's proposal was not clearly spelled out. His recommendations included the condition that a survey be obtained and that a new site plan be submitted.

Mr. Eglick indicated that he had intended to meet the Board at the site visit to show how the retaining walls affect his client's property. They are higher than the natural grade of the property. He wished to have stipulated in the conditions that the height of the building be measured from the natural grade, not the artificial grade created with the construction of the parking slab and retaining wall.

Mr. Eglick felt that a proposed new retaining wall is inappropriate, as his clients maintained at the first public meeting. The revised plan eliminates the need for this wall, and creates a "sub-basement" effect on his client's property.

Finally, Mr. Eglick felt that the Shoreline Master Program requires that even if the retaining wall does not meet the cost standard of \$2,500 for application of the Shoreline Program, it still applies under section 7-P of the Shoreline Program. Landfills in the rural residential zone, he stated, are regulated under the Shoreline Program, according to this section. In Mr. Eglick's interpretation, the retaining wall construction constitutes a landfill.

If the Board chooses not to honor his clients' wishes and deny the variance, and the variance is to be granted, Mr. Eglick requested these items be included in the findings and decision.

Planning Department staff responded to Mr. Eglick's testimony. Zoe Pfahl defended her location of the OHWM, stating that the Shoreline Administrator has authority to set the OHWM under the Shoreline Master Plan. She stated that staff does not feel a survey is required.

Mr. Eglick stated that he does not question staff's ability to set the OHWM, but feels a survey would allow better relation of the location of the future improvements to the OHWM.

Oscar Graham showed on the plat map where Arlan C. Mootz was granted a variance in 1980 on property about 250 feet north of the subject property. A copy of a letter from the Department of Ecology granting this variance was submitted. A map identifying the location of other variances with red "x"swas also provided.

Mr. Graham conceded that a current application showing the Mr. Rindal's recent proposal modifications is not on file; however, an accurate reflection of the conditions and regulations on the proposal can be outlined in the resolution of the Board setting forth today's decision.

Regarding the fill component of the proposal, it has not previously been represented in the proposal and has come about through the application process. In cases where fill is placed in biologic wetlands, Skagit County has required shorelines permits; however, it appears these do not exist in the area of the fill on the Rindal property.

Mr. Eglick again defended his clients' position, repeating earlier remarks he had made.

Zoe Pfahl clarified that both she and Mr. Eglick were discussing the same retaining wall.

Barry Butler, Island Construction, clarified that he had originally chosen the site of the OHWM, which was later very slightly modified during verification by Bob McGill.

Jerry Rindal stated that the purpose of the retaining wall and fill is to level the lawn area. It is four feet in height, and is not within the shoreline area. Other walls along the shoreline in the area have been constructed for this same purpose.

Fred Dunlap, owner of the property to the north, remarked that his concern is that drainage may be effected by the retaining wall. He wondered if the sides of the wall would be boxed in, and if it would be level with the proposed deck.

Mr. Butler confirmed that there would be a side wall anchoring the retaining wall to the property.

Mr. Rindal stated that the wall will be level with his lawn, four feet above the deck, and will be filled with sand, which will drain water onto the beach.

Mr. Eglick stated that the retaining wall will not be level from the viewpoint of his clients' property.

Commissioner Vaux asked Mr. Graham to clarify if the retaining wall requires a permit. Mr. Graham stated that cuts and fills that are incidental to the construction of a residence do not require a shoreline permit. Additionally, the Rindal site is not a within a biological wetland adjacent to Big Lake. Structurally, bulkheads require fill or they will fail, and bulkheads, constructed strictly within shoreline guidelines, do not require a

permit. Whether Mr. Rindal's retaining wall is a bulkhead or not is unknown. If it is not associated with a bulkhead, placement of fill would require a Shorelines conditional use permit.

Nancy Dunlap read a prepared statement. She felt that the need for the variance is because of actions taken by Mr. Rindal himself. She felt he is attempting to better his view of the lake, to the detriment of the Dunlap property.

Hearing no further comment, Commissioner Wylie motioned to close the public hearing. Commissioner Vaux seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Commissioner Wylie then motioned to schedule a decision on this matter for Monday, August 24, 1992, at 1:30 p.m. Commissioner Vaux seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**MEETING REGARDING ILLEGAL DUMPING. BIRDSVIEW GRANGE, RUSSELL ROAD, BIRDSVIEW.**

**ATTENDING:**

**Skagit County Commissioners:**

Robby Robinson  
Bill Vaux  
Ruth Wylie

**Skagit County Health Department:**

Keith Fredrikson  
Ken Willis  
John Thayer

**Skagit County Public Works:**

Ric Boge

**Skagit County Upriver Services**

Cheri Cook

(\* indicates interest in continued participation)

\*Don Bockelman, 2863 S. Skagit Highway, Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

Bill & Gladys Colvin, 4115 Challenger, Concrete, WA 98237

Stephen Hansen, 2222 N. Trumpeter Dr., Mt. Vernon, WA 98273

John Keller, D.N.R., 919 N. Township, Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

\*Ken LePage, P.O. Box 352, Concrete, WA 98237

\*Robert & Laurel Perrigo, 3500 Highway 20, Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

\*Don Slocum, P. O. Box 426, Hamilton, WA 98255

Truman Sparks, 3763 Highway 20, Concrete, WA 98237

George Theodoratus, 3593 Highway 20, Concrete, WA 98237

The forum began at 7:10 pm with opening remarks by Keith Fredrikson and introduction of County personnel.

The majority of illegal dumping is happening upriver; this is the only topic for discussion this evening. The meeting's purpose is to:

1. Establish an Ad Hoc advisory committee to follow through with ideas brought forward at the meeting.
2. Gauge public opinion on illegal garbage dumping, and solicit ideas for controlling the problem.

3. Encourage support for a "neighborhood watch" type effort to monitor and clean up illegal dump sites.
4. Gauge the amount of support for mandatory collection which would theoretically cut down on the amount of illegal dumping.

Fredrikson: The Skagit County Health Department responds to complaints of illegal dumping in an enforcement role. They investigate the site, looking for evidence of who did the dumping. To levy a fine, they must find three pieces of evidence with the person's name on them. This is often difficult. If it can be determined, the person is sent a letter giving them ten days to clean up the site, or else they are fined. If there is no evidence of who did the dumping, the Health Department has authority to fine the landowners. This is often unfair to the landowners, and the Health Department would like to explore other options in prevention or cleanup. When problems exist, landowners may close off their land and deny any public access. In some cases this deprives the public of recreation access.

Willis: It was suggested that a group be formed to assist landowners in cleanup when there is no evidence of who did the dumping.

Mandatory collection has been suggested as another alternative; public responses have been both positive and negative. It would assure that everyone pays their fair share for disposal, and would theoretically leave no excuse for illegal dumping. This may be used "down the road".

Fredrikson: There is a big problem with (junk) automobiles; they are bulky and expensive to dispose of. Procedures must be followed with the sheriff's department, including notifying the legal owner and paying for the cost of disposal.

Willis: Numerous reports are coming from citizens and civic leaders about a disproportionate amount of illegal dumping. As tipping fees go up, so does illegal dumping. An advisory committee can refine this group's suggestions and present them to the commissioners.

Slocum: If there are mandatory collection fees, how do you enforce those who don't pay? Cut off their service? You can't fine them. That's not a solution.

Fredrikson: If collection bills are unpaid, a lien can be put on the property.

Willis: It's been suggested that it be collected as a tax. Taking cases to court can be labor intensive.

Slocum: Mandatory collection is hard to enforce. What about the people who leave their cans out, and the kids come along on their motorcycles and run over them, leave garbage spread out all over the place. Also dogs get into them. In the city you can fight it, but out here there's too much open space, and they can get away with things easier.

Every time you change the rates, we start seeing garbage all over the place. Can a tax subsidize the compactors? I've had to call the attendant when I could only get two bags in the compactor for six dollars. The compactor attendant had to come down and take care of it. Some people don't know what to do when the compactor doesn't work, and they just pile up their garbage. If the compactor was cheaper, and was taken care of, this would help eliminate the garbage.

Fredrikson: The rates are already subsidized.

Boge: The compactor sites operate at a loss, even at the current rates. They can't go down. The Solid Waste Division has to meet many state and federal requirements. Trying to keep a stable rate is a challenge. Skagit County has a very competitive tipping fee compared to other counties.

Fredrikson: A study could be made...

Bockelman: Don't think that money should go to fund another study. The old and poor people can't afford to pay the rates at the compactor.

Slocum: If the garbage won't go in, it will be in the street. Also, the campers, when they have no place to put their garbage, may throw it out in a field on their way home. They come from out of the area, and we can't prove anything.

\_\_\_\_\_: What about having free dumping, but incorporating the dump cost in a tax?

Boge: Problem with that is it doesn't provide incentives for recycling.

\_\_\_\_\_: What about free dumping for those who sort (out recyclables)?

\_\_\_\_\_: If we get to a police situation and lawsuits, then that would be more expensive than subsidizing dumping fees. Putting the burden on property owners is not fair. You create a problem when you pick on the landowners. It's better to cut the rates down. Also, too many agencies are spending money on studies.

Fredrikson: There are also costs involved in picking up garbage.

\_\_\_\_\_: When the county picks up the garbage, don't they also have to pay for disposal? (Yes.) Wouldn't fee waivers cure a portion of the problem?

\_\_\_\_\_: What is the cost of picking up Skagit County's garbage for a year?

Fredrikson: It's estimated at about \$1500 per month along road rights-of-way.

\_\_\_\_\_: That's the cost of labor, versus tipping fees. What would it cost us?

Fredrikson: The money has to come from somewhere. We also need something to assist those who have been dumped on.

Thayer: We're not financial people in the Health Department. The Commissioners are the ones who have to balance the budget. There is a need to protect public health and the environment, but it costs. We're here to propose novel ideas, and look for ways to share the burden.

Bockelman: If I find things lying around on my property, and it costs for disposal, I'll leave them. If there's no cost, I'll pick them up. Batteries are commonly found in the bushes, and I turn those in. But tires--if they were illegally dumped on my property, I would have to pay, or take them to the transfer station, and I wouldn't do it.

Vaux: An example from the Lake Campbell area, there were two flatbed truck loads of sheet rock and remodeling debris dumped on someone's property. It cost \$300 for the property owner to get rid of it. They found documents and tracked down where it came from (Oak Harbor). The property owner shouldn't have had to pay, but did. The point is, we need some kind of vehicle to pay for "county cleansing".



Theodoratus: A lot of stuff, car bodies and appliances, turned up on some of my property, down along the river where people go fishing. They ripped down the "No Trespassing" signs. This was located next to Cape Horn. The next step is to lock it up.

\_\_\_\_\_: People can be pretty bold. Saw an older couple taking what looked like sacks of garbage out of their car on the Burpee Hill Road, and then drove away. They just waved as they went past us. We went back, and sure enough, it was their garbage.

Slocum: Not all the garbage comes from the area it's dumped in. People from Birdsvie might go up to Rockport or Marblemount and dump. And the campers from Baker Lake--they just toss it out on their way back down. One of the little lakes up there (Everett) has more garbage than could be put there by the people who use it.

Theodoratus: If there is a tax, it should be on residences, not vacant land. And, if we have cheap tipping rates, we'll fill up our collection facilities with garbage from other areas.

Slocum: In Montana, you have to have a county sticker to dump your garbage. The state lets you dump all you can dump for \$3.00. And the state patrol enforces illegal dumping with a \$500 fine. That's for a sackful or a truckload. It's signed on the highways, and it's a real deterrent. They don't tax the people who are not at fault.

Vaux: They have different conditions there than we do here. We don't have any more landfill sites being opened in western Washington.

Slocum: What's the population of Skagit County?

Vaux: About 84,000 in 1991.

Slocum: The Missoula area has over 110,000, and they don't have illegal dumping problems because of the enforcement.

Fredrikson: It's a lower priority in this state.

Willis: Finding the dumpers takes a tremendous amount of time. In 1984 the landfill fees were \$10. Today it's \$90 for a truckload at the landfill and \$80 at the incinerator. The public has become more sophisticated about illegal dumping. It's tough to identify the dumpers. We have had various groups such as juvenile offenders working off community service hours, or Youth Conservation Corps members providing cleanup service, but it's labor intensive. Also, it cleaned up the mess, but didn't stop the problem. We need to (1) provide a combination of education and enforcement; (2) provide the landowners with some relief in cleanup and disposal cost; (3) mobilize public spirited citizens into a volunteer force. Collection in rural areas is already subsidized. The incinerator and transfer site costs \$12 a truckload. The landfill costs \$20 a truckload; self-hauls are subsidized.

Slocum: The compactor sites aren't even open two days a week. We need to have them open daily. It doesn't cost any more to keep the gates open. The last time I was there, the operator had to get rid of five bags of garbage that were set against the gate before it could even be opened. Someone just left it there.

\_\_\_\_\_: People should have their names published in the paper if they are caught.

Slocum: The people who are dumping are renters, not landowners. They don't pay taxes. We should offer a reward for turning them in, some incentive.

Willis: Is there a consensus for more enforcement? We also need to agree on how to fine the offenders. It's rare for us to identify the offender (from examination of the garbage). Sometimes there are several names that show up. Occasionally, we may implicate the wrong person.

Fredrikson: It's easier to identify auto bodies, but that also does not always get back to the right person.

Boge: I would be in favor of increasing the fines, and reducing the amount of proof needed.

\_\_\_\_\_: Strong enforcement starts to sound like a police state.

\_\_\_\_\_: On the Cape Horn Road, it often happens at night. If you can't catch the people, you can't enforce it.

\_\_\_\_\_: Would be in favor of a \$500 fine.

\_\_\_\_\_: A \$500 fine would be unreasonable for those who can't afford to take their garbage to the dump. There is a correlation between higher rates and more illegal dumping. Poor people have to make choices between necessities and paying for garbage disposal. The County could provide funds with a surcharge on tipping fees.

Cook: DSHS provides credit vouchers for other services. What about a credit for garbage service?

Wylie: What about the State Highways cleanup program, where service clubs clean roadsides? (Adopt-A-Highway)

\_\_\_\_\_: Birdsvew Grange does highway cleanup. We collect litter from Birdsvew Burgers to "the end of the sandwich"--about 20 bags every three months; we have safety hats and gear. The hamburger joint should help! Also, we collect plastic oil containers at the Baker Lake cutoff. A lot of people park there, then toss the containers in the bushes. We collect 15 or 20 at a time, but there's no way to spot the trucks that dump them. A lot of people park in that area.

Boge: We need to change people's attitudes by education, and revitalize citizen pride in the area.

Vaux: I was following a Cascade Clear bottled water truck out by Anacortes when an empty water container blew off. The truck driver was going back to pick it up when another car stopped, grabbed the container, and took off!

Slocum: What about renters, who don't pay county taxes? There must be some way they can be made to pay for services.

Fredrikson: The landlords generally figure the cost of property taxes into the rental rate. Tax increases will eventually get back to the renters.

Keller: Has experience with the DNR in eastern Skagit County and Snohomish County. Wherever there is a population center, there is illegal dumping. The last cases of illegal dumping identified in Snohomish County were business owners--it's not always the poor. Have to agree with "putting the hurt" on them. How many cases did you (Skagit County) prosecute last year? (None) Generally there is no evidence, or it's just

not worth it for what you get out of it. Maybe a \$500 fine isn't enough. We recently received money for cleanup operations, but found out that problems here are much less than on other lands.

\_\_\_\_\_: We need to educate the children.

Boge: We have a waste reduction and recycling education program for kids in the schools. It needs to be made more of a priority, and include community cleanup.

Willis: Education needs to include both the old and the young, although the kids will be here longer than the rest of us.

\_\_\_\_\_: We need to target the favorite dumping spots, and have law enforcement officers stake out the areas. Then put the offenders to work cleaning up the site, as well as fining them.

Willis: That's being done, but it hasn't stopped the problem.

Slocum: How many tickets with a \$25 fine have been issued by the County? (Don't know.) A steeper fine would make them more attentive.

\_\_\_\_\_: There may be a problem legally with steeper fines. In the state, there used to be a \$500 fine for highway littering. The Supreme Court ruled that it was *cruel and unusual punishment*, and the signs disappeared.

Cook: What about a toll-free "800" number to report dumping, like the number to report drunk driving?

Willis: There may be a problem with legalities and follow-up. Will have to check on this.

Fredrickson: Do we have some support for further action? Suggestions have included increased taxes, increased tipping fees, increased enforcement. We need to form an advisory board to develop an augmented approach. Ken will check on the legality issues of citizen complaints. We will circulate a summary of the meeting to those attending, and can also add other names to the mailing list. We need to keep up the momentum we have here.

\_\_\_\_\_: There is concern for the personal safety of people who confront illegal dumpers. Some might not hesitate to shoot you, if they were caught!

Wylie: What about videotaping? But we don't want to pit neighbors against each other in this. We need to keep education a priority, and campaign for pride in the community..."People, pride and progress".

Slocum: That would be a good campaign issue for those running for election.

Cook: Concrete School District has a new program, Project Service Learning, to start this fall, where kids get school credit for community service work. There was a lot of interest in community cleanup and recycling projects, and they could tie into this.

Slocum: When citizen groups do cleanup, they need to be able to dispose of the garbage for free.

Boge: That is currently available, for civic groups doing cleanup on public property, and separating out recyclables. Also, the compactor sites have recycling service available four consecutive days per month,

starting on the last Friday.

\_\_\_\_\_: If people see signs posted, it will encourage them to dispose of their garbage legally.

Slocum: The state has videos on keeping communities cleaned up. Are they available to the schools? Having more educational programs may help.

Robinson: The Commissioners appreciate your input. We need a reasonable and cost-effective plan which will take care of the people in need, and to share the costs. Also, we need your consensus. Thank you for attending.

Forum adjourned at 8:35 pm.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Wylie motioned to adjourn the proceedings. Commissioner Vaux seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.


BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robby Robinson, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth Wylie, Commissioner

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
W. W. Vaux, Commissioner

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Connie Carter, Clerk  
Skagit County Board of Commissioners

