

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
SKAGIT COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
Monday, September 13, 1999**

- *T 9:45 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. Proclamation – Men’s Health Day, September 18, 1999.
- 10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m. Public Comment Period.
- CONSENT AGENDA.
MISCELLANEOUS.**
- 10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. Public Hearing – Possible Renewal of Interim Ordinance No. 17419, “Personal Wireless Service Facilities.”
- *T 11:30 a.m. – Noon Information Services Department Year 2000 Update.
- *T 1:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. Review of the 1999 Skagit County Fair.
- 2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Executive Session – Personnel, Litigation and Land Acquisition.
- 5:00 p.m. Public Hearing – Interim Ordinance No. 17523 that removes the Urban Growth Area Designation from the Area shown as the Big Lake Urban Growth Area on Comprehensive Plan Map 3(h) in the 1997 Comprehensive Plan Map Portfolio on an Interim Basis and Replaces it with a Rural Village Designation. (Hearing Room “C”)

The Skagit County Board of Commissioners met in regular session on Monday, September 13, 1999, with Commissioners Ted W. Anderson, Harvey Wolden, and Robert Hart present.

PROCLAMATION – MEN’S HEALTH DAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1999.

Commissioner Hart read the Proclamation into the record, and moved to adopt same. Chairman Anderson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

Jim Youngsman, 18697 Hickox Road, Mount Vernon, spoke regarding the Growth Management Act (GMA), giving some of the history of the Act while he was a legislator. He detailed one of the changes in the Act that he voted for because it encouraged local input and local control. Mr. Youngsman stated that the original GMA had goals which were and are important, including encouraging the availability of affordable housing, increased economic development, protection of private property rights, and timely and fair permit processing. He stated that the original intent of GMA also encouraged the involvement of citizens in the planning process and coordination between jurisdictions. Mr. Youngsman stated that he and those gathered are offended that the County would enter into an agreement with the Friends of Skagit County (FOSC) with very little input from citizens.

Mike Crawford, 20675 Rocky Ridge Lane, Sedro Woolley, expressed his understanding that the Board is caught in a difficult situation regarding GMA issues. He stated that there is a growing concern among all landowners that they are getting separated from their government. He commented on the agreement with FOSC and the fear that County citizens will be locked in to the details that are contained in the agreement. He asked that the Board consider rescinding the agreement with FOSC. Mr. Crawford stated that the County has won most of the appeals involving FOSC, so the County apparently is doing a good job. He questioned whether citizens would have to live in limbo and wait until the Development Code is completed to do anything with their property. He asked that the

RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS

Monday, September 13, 1999

Page #2

Board consider rescinding the agreement. Mr. Crawford further offered to help in this process, and noted that he understood that the County must comply with State regulations.

Carl Loeb, 20469 Cascade Ridge Drive, commented that if land use rules being developed under the threat of an outside group are bad for agriculture, we need to look closely at this overall process of how we got here. He agreed with Mr. Crawford that the Agreement with FOSC must be rescinded. He indicated that if FOSC believes that the vision of Skagit County is a rural place where the ability of farmers to make a living is of no concern, the County's agricultural lifestyle would be lost. He stated that the people the Board should concentrate on and keep happy are the people who provide jobs.

Paul Taylor, 584 Cedar Drive, Bow, expressed his shock when reading the Agreement with FOSC as it appears the County has succumbed to a special interest group and wants to control private property owners and business people in Skagit County. He asked the Board to rescind the Agreement with FOSC.

Mike Woodmansee, County Administrator, reviewed the recent County success in land use designation appeals. He stated that the Board and Staff are working with the agricultural community to develop strategies that will pass GMA muster. He indicated that Staff is not trying to thwart private citizens, and that Staff is more than willing to sit down with some of the folks assembled and get an understanding of what it is about the agreement with FOSC that is so difficult. Mr. Woodmansee stated that there were about six appeals put off that the County would have had to respond to if that agreement was not in place. This allows Staff time to concentrate on other issues, such as the finalization of the Development Code. He stated that there are certainly people gathered in the room with concerns and values that need to be addressed and considered.

CONSENT AGENDA.

Commissioner Wolden moved to approve the Consent Agenda for Monday, September 13, 1999, items 1 –12, and items 14-19, removing Item No. 13 until further clarification could be obtained. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The Consent Agenda for Monday, September 13, 1999 was approved.

COMMISSIONERS' OFFICE:

1. Record of the Proceedings for Tuesday, September 7, 1999.
2. Record of the Proceedings for Thursday, September 9, 1999.
3. Resolution and Interlocal Agreement with the Anacortes School District for improvements at the Anacortes High School Strength and Conditioning Center wherein the County will pay to the School District the sum of \$40,000. **(Resolution No. 17562, Contract No. 04579)**

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT:

4. Resolution re: Notice of Road Closure, Concrete Sauk Valley Road, No. 8000 for September 27 through October 1, 1999. **(Resolution No. 17563)**
5. Administrative Settlement Summary for the Farm-to-Market Road Improvement Project compensating Hughes Farms \$7,000 for approximately 1 acre of crop loss. **(Approved)**
6. Resolution Awarding the Bid for Conversion of Roadway Striper to an Airless Spray Unit for Waterborne Paint to TMT – Pathway LLC, Co. of Salem Oregon for a total bid price of \$44,935.08. **(Resolution No. 17564)**

RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS

Monday, September 13, 1999

Page #3

7. Vendor Services Agreement with Crane Pro Services to perform two annual inspections on F.T. Crowe Rail Crane, P&H Jib Cranes, truck mounted boom crane, Monorail crane and P&H Bridge Crane in compliance with the requirements of OSHA. The contract begins September 1, 1999 and will terminate on January 1, 2001. Compensation is not to exceed \$3,900. **(Contract No. 04580)**
8. Governor's Salmon Recovery Grant Agreement for salmon recovery projects from funds received from the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Services for a not-to-exceed amount of \$420,000. The ALEA Program will reimburse Skagit County for all costs that exceed this amount. The project reimbursement period shall begin on April 16, 1999 and end on September 30, 2000. **(Contract No. 04581)**
9. On-Call Environmental Services Agreement with Parametrix, Inc. to provide environmental services for various project locations. The contract term expires December 31, 2000, and the maximum amount payable is \$100,000. **(Contract No. 04582)**

MAPPING DEPARTMENT:

10. Out-of-State Travel Request for Geoff Almvig, Mario Brown, and Kari Secrest to attend the Street Smart and Address Savvy Program in San Antonio, Texas, October 5 – 8, 1999, for total travel costs of \$3,206.45. **(Approved)**

CLERK'S OFFICE:

11. Appointment and Oath of Office of Cynda Cherri' Reid as Deputy County Clerk. **(Approved)**

FARMLAND LEGACY PROGRAM:

12. Conservation Easement for Stephen & Julie Johnson protecting approximately 31.35 acres of farmland on Best Road. This easement is required by the County to fulfill a land division requirement under SCC 14.04.112, which permits the creation of a substandard lot for an existing residence in the agriculture zone. The Farmland legacy Program is not paying the landowner for this easement, however, the County will be responsible for future costs associated with the monitoring and enforcement of the terms of the easement. **(Contract No. 04583)**

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

13. Vendor Services Agreement with Wallace Wilkens, Ph.D., to provide training and consultation services, and any associated materials, to enhance the supervisory and managerial knowledge and skills of Supervisors and Managers. Fees to be paid by the County are \$1,050 per ½ day seminar, plus mileage, meals and lodging if necessary, \$1,500 per 1-day seminar, plus mileage, meals and lodging if necessary, and \$2,450 per 2-day seminar, plus mileage, meals and lodging if necessary. There is no termination date on the contract. **(Removed from Consent Agenda pending further explanation)**

YOUTH & FAMILY SERVICES:

14. Personal Services Agreement with Judith Bosworth for individual and/or family therapy at rates ranging from \$20 to \$60 per hour for the period August 1, 1999 until terminated. **(Contract No. 04584)**
15. Addendum No. 1 to Personal Services Agreement with Julian Byrd to expand the scope of work to include individual and family therapy, group therapy, case consultation, education classes, and travel time at rates ranging from \$20 to \$60, effective July 1, 1999. **(Contract No. 03024)**

RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS

Monday, September 13, 1999

Page #4

16. Food Services Agreement (Child Nutrition Programs) with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction for continuation of the National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program in Juvenile Detention. **(Contract No. 04585)**

HEALTH DEPARTMENT:

17. Personal Services Agreement with Cecily Fosso, RDH, Inc. to provide oral health dental hygienist services at the rate of \$1,358 per month beginning September 1, 1999 and continuing until terminated. **(Contract No. 04586)**

PLANNING & PERMIT CENTER:

18. Vendor Services Agreement with Robert A. Neale for plan review at the direction of the Skagit County Building Official of fire sprinkler and other fire system plans at an hourly rate of \$55. The contract begins May 1, 1999 and will continue until terminated. **(Contract No. 04587)**

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT:

19. Personal Services Agreement with Pacific Consulting Services to provide professional services related to the review and determination of operational upgrades for the existing radio and communication center (Skagit 9-1-1 Center) needs including law enforcement, fire, emergency medical and public works departments. Compensation is not to exceed \$2,600 for the Radio System Improvement Project. The costs for these services will be reimbursed by the State Enhanced 9-1-1- Grant. **(Contract No. 04588)**

MISCELLANEOUS.

1. Vouchers audited and certified by the auditing officer as required by R.C.W. 42.24.080, and those expense reimbursement claims certified as required by R.C.W. 42.24.090, have been recorded on a listing, which has been made available to the Board.

As of this date, September 13, 1999, the Board, by a majority vote, did approve for payment those vouchers included in the above-mentioned list and further described as follows:

Payroll warrants numbered 951878 through 951939 in the total dollar amount of \$67,113.24 (Transmittal No. P-33-99);

Payroll warrants numbered 39795 through 40710 in the total dollar amount of \$818,323.96 (Transmittal No. P-34-99).

Warrants numbered 52404 through 52793 from Clearing Fund 696 in the total dollar amount of \$979,087.68 (Transmittal No. C-66-99); and

Warrants numbered 52794 through 52797 from Clearing Fund 696 in the total dollar amount of \$28,025.37 (Transmittal No. C-67-99).

2. Staff presented a Resolution appointing Sandra MacKellar as a County Designated Mental Health Professional beginning September 13, 1999. Commissioner Wolden moved to approve the appointment of Ms. MacKellar as presented. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. **(Resolution No. 17566)**

RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS

Monday, September 13, 1999

Page #5

3. Staff presented an Out-of-State Travel Request for Jacqueline Vander Veen to attend a course on fluvial geomorphology offered by Wildland Hydrology Consultants held in Pagosa Springs, Colorado, October 19-28, 1999, for a total cost of \$2,400. Ms. Vander Veen will be replacing Dale Muir who was originally scheduled to attend the course, but has opted not to attend at this time. Commissioner Hart moved to approve the Out-of-State Travel Request as presented, and Commissioner Wolden seconded the motion. The motion passed with a unanimous vote. **(Approved)**
4. Staff presented an Out-of-State Travel Request for David C. Fair to attend the Oregon & Idaho Parks & Recreation Association Joint Conference in Pendleton, Oregon, October 3-6, 1999 for a total cost of \$541. Commissioner Wolden moved to approve the Out-of-State Travel Request as presented. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. **(Approved)**

PUBLIC HEARING – POSSIBLE RENEWAL OF INTERIM ORDINANCE No. 17419, “PERSONAL WIRELESS SERVICE FACILITIES.”

Marge Swint, Associate Planner, reviewed with the Board that there are no proposed changes to the existing interim ordinance.

There being no public comment forthcoming, Commissioner Wolden moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Hart moved to readopt Interim Ordinance 17419, “Personal Wireless Services Facilities.” Commissioner Wolden seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. **(Resolution to be provided by Staff at a later date)**

INFORMATION SERVICES DEPARTMENT YEAR 2000 UPDATE.

Michael Almvig, Information Services Director, reviewed Skagit County's Year 2000 Compliance efforts. He stated that the briefing is intended to discuss Year 2000 readiness for Skagit County Government's computer systems and facilities, and is not intended to discuss more global issues of power, food and water distribution. Mr. Almvig stated that a public forum to address more global Y2K issues would be held on October 9, 1999, at Burlington-Edison High School, 9:00 a.m. - Noon.

Mr. Almvig stated that this presentation is being designated as a Year 2000 Readiness Disclosure and the information contained is provided pursuant to the terms of the Year 2000 Information and Readiness Disclosure Act.

Mr. Almvig reviewed the history of the County's Y2K Program, noting that the Y2K Readiness program was established by Skagit County Resolution No. 17016, which identified each department head and elected official responsible for the readiness of their departments. He reviewed the process for resolving Y2K compliance issues, including regular assessments and methods to resolve non-compliance issues.

Mr. Almvig indicated that currently Information Services is tracking 175 software applications, of which over 90% are compliant, and only 5 non-compliant applications are critical to County operations. He commented on the Office Administrator for the Courts (OAC) issues. He reviewed the particulars of other issues within County purview.

Mr. Almvig stated that the biggest concern of Y2K is the potential loss of power, and that an emergency generator is being installed which will keep computers handling emergency services on-line. He informed the Board that Financial, Public Safety and most computer systems are in compliance. Other Y2K upgrades completed over the summer include Permit Tracking, Auditor's Recording, Jury Management System, Health Department Medical Manager System, Auditor's Voter Registration System, and Sheriff's Mug Shot System. These systems were all non-compliant at the beginning of the year.

Assessments and problem solving will occur right up to 1/1/2000, according to Mr. Almvig. He indicated that departments should expect a lot of computer patches as the end of the year approaches. He also warned that

County Departments can expect an increase in the number of computer viruses towards the beginning of the year. He urged Department Heads to try to have as much first of the year business completed prior to January as possible, and to have contingency plans in place in the event of failures.

Mr. Almvig stated that the Public Access Web Page would go on-line in September/October and will contain Y2K information for the general public. He stated that the County will use the site for emergency purposes and the posting of emergency information. He stated that Departments should also use the internal web page to track and plan for Y2K issues.

Mr. Almvig indicated that Information Services staff will be on-call for Emergency Services on December 31, 1999, with the priority to keep Emergency Operations from failing.

Tom Sheahan, Emergency Management Department, spoke regarding the flood and emergency exercise on September 29th, which will test for Y2K issues that could arise.

REVIEW OF THE 1999 SKAGIT COUNTY FAIR.

This agenda item was cancelled.

Commissioner Anderson was absent for the remainder of the proceedings.

PUBLIC HEARING – INTERIM ORDINANCE NO. 17523 THAT REMOVES THE URBAN GROWTH AREA DESIGNATION FROM THE AREA SHOWN AS THE BIG LAKE URBAN GROWTH AREA ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP 3(h) IN THE 1997 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP PORTFOLIO ON AN INTERIM BASIS AND REPLACES IT WITH A RURAL VILLAGE DESIGNATION.

See attached Court Reporter Transcript.


ADJOURNMENT.

Commissioner Hart made a motion to adjourn the proceedings. Commissioner Wolden seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON



Ted W. Anderson, Chairman


Harvey Wolden, Commissioner


Robert Hart, Commissioner



ATTEST:


Patti J. Chambers, Clerk of the Board
Skagit County Board of Commissioners

BEFORE THE SKAGIT COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

IN RE: Public Hearing relating to)
Interim Ordinance No. 17523 that)
removes UGA designation from the Big) September 13, 1999
Lake UGA and replaces it with a)
Rural Village designation)

VERBATIM RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

=====

A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S:

Board of Commissioners:

Mr. Robert Hart
Mr. Harvey Wolden

Planning Department Staff:

Mr. Gary Christensen

COPY

Allen R. Emerson & Associates
Court Reporters
1226 McGarigle Street
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
(360) 856-2618 Skagit County
(360) 734-2262 Whatcom County

1 PUBLIC HEARING before the Skagit County Board
2 of Commissioners in Hearing Room "C" of the County
3 Administration Building in reference to the above
4 entitled matter and reported by ALLEN R. EMERSON &
5 ASSOCIATES, commencing at the hour of 5:00 o'clock p.m.
6 on Monday, September 13, 1999;

7 WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were
8 had, to wit:

9 MR. HART: Good afternoon, it's 5:00. I am
10 sitting in as chair of the hearing tonight.
11 Commissioner Anderson was not feeling well and is not
12 here. However, we are having this recorded with a
13 court reporter and the transcript will be available for
14 him to read before our deliberation.

15 The purpose of this public hearing is to
16 receive public comment regarding Interim Ordinance No.
17 17523 that removes the UGA designation from the area
18 shown as the Big Lake UGA on Comprehensive Plan Map
19 3(h) in the 1997 Comprehensive Plan Map Portfolio on an
20 interim basis and replacing it with a Rural Village
21 designation.

22 If you have not received or obtained a copy
23 of the proposal, you can find additional copies on the
24 sign up table.

25 Those of you who wish to provide testimony

2

1 are asked to sign up on the speakers list. Please
2 limit your comments to a 3-minute period so that
3 everyone will have a chance to speak. Special interest
4 groups, associations and those representing others are
5 encouraged to designate a spokesperson for your group.

6 Tonight's hearing will close when no further
7 testimony is forthcoming. Written comments are
8 encouraged and will be received until the close of
9 tonight's hearing.

10 A court reporter is present this evening to
11 record your comments. Before you testify, clearly
12 state your name and spell your last name for the record
13 and indicate where you reside.

14 Scheduled deliberation on the interim
15 ordinance is next week, September 20th, Monday, at
16 10:15 a.m. Thank you.

17 I will call off everyone's name on the list.
18 If some of you do not wish to speak, you can simply
19 decline.

20 We'll begin at the top of the list, Rich
21 Dietz, would you like to speak? Please come forward to
22 the mike.

23 MR. DIETZ: What I'd like to do is, my name
24 is Rich Dietz, I reside at 615 East Chestnut,
25 Bellingham, Washington at this time. And I brought our

3

1 representative from Skagit Surveyors with us and I'd
2 like her to lead in before I speak.

3 MR. HART: Okay, so you'd like to decline at
4 this time and we'll let Marianne speak at this time?

5 MR. DIETZ: Yes.

6 MR. HART: Okay.

7 MS. MANVILLE-AILLES: My name is Marianne
8 Manville-Ailles and I'll give you a business card when
9 we're done so you can spell that because it's a mouth
10 full, I know. I'm with Skagit Surveyors and Engineers
11 at 806 Metcalf Street in Sedro Woolley.

12 Thank you, gentlemen. I have handed a packet
13 of information to each of you and there's nothing in
14 that packet of information that is new. This is all of
15 the information that has been submitted to you before
16 on the piece of property which we're talking about,
17 which we're all familiar with, Mr. Perry and
18 Mr. Dietz's properties.

19 I gave you this packet of information again,
20 partly because at the last time when you gentlemen
21 discussed this and passed the interim ordinance,
22 Mr. Woodhansee had indicated that he didn't believe
23 that there was enough information in the record to
24 allow you to look at this property at that time. And I
25 believe he was mistaken when he made that comment. As

4

1 you can see there was a great deal of information that
2 had been made available and had been considered during
3 the public hearings that have been held on this, during
4 your deliberations on it, the Planning Commission's
5 deliberations on it.

6 As you know, Mr. Perry and Mr. Dietz did go
7 through the Boundary Review Board and were annexed into
8 the Big Lake sewer district unanimously. And at that
9 time part of the things that were discussed by the
10 Boundary Review Board were the growth management issues
11 that are associated with this piece of property. And
12 they believe that, because this truly is a mapping
13 error, the property is bisected by the, was at that
14 time bisected by the sewer district's boundary, and is
15 now all within the sewer district.

16 So these pieces of property are now the only
17 pieces of property in this Big Lake area that are
18 within the sewer district boundary, but are not within
19 what is now the Big Lake Rural Village.

20 When you discussed this just in July, we were
21 under the impression and under the assumption, it had
22 been indicated to us, at this time you would be taking
23 this matter into consideration and fixing the mapping
24 error that has existed here.

25 We went through the whole 1997 comprehensive

VOL 93 714

5

1 plan amendment process and because of the noncompliance
2 order in the Abenroth case, it was determined that that
3 was not the appropriate forum to correct that mapping
4 error, but that when the Big Lake Urban Growth Area was
5 again addressed that that would be the time to correct
6 this situation.

7 And I think it was agreed that every time it
8 was discussed that this is a mapping error and that it
9 does need to be remedied. And yet when you did discuss
10 this in July, which was when the time it was designated
11 for correcting this error, it was not addressed. And
12 now again we're being told that this is going to be put
13 off until the UDC is adopted.

14 And I am a little bit confused as to how this
15 boundary and mapping error issue is tied into the
16 Unified Development Code which is to address
17 development regulations. And I don't see the
18 correlation between the two. I think that they are
19 separate processes and that this is something that you
20 can and should deal with now as these gentlemen have
21 patiently waited now for several years and have gone
22 through every step of the process as they have been
23 required to, and still the property remains bisected by
24 the rural village line. Thank you.

25 MR. HART: Thank you.

6

1 Mike Perry. Do you wish to say anything
2 additional at this time?

3 MR. PERRY: Yeah, Mike Perry, 941 Sudden
4 Valley, Bellingham, Washington and hopefully,
5 eventually a Skagit County resident if we get this
6 straightened out.

7 You know, basically on all the information
8 that we've gathered from the professionals we've hired
9 and the consultation with the County Commissioners as
10 Marianne, you know, has thoroughly mentioned, we've
11 abided by the process and done exactly as you have told
12 us with a virtual guarantee at each step that this
13 mapping error would be corrected. And each time one
14 more thing came up that we needed to, or process that
15 we had to follow through and we have done that
16 judiciously to this point.

17 Now, if there's another code beyond this or
18 something, that's fine but it's our standpoint that we
19 need to be dealt with now and have this resolved.
20 Because the UDC, I guess if that's what it is, it's not
21 applicable to our situation. There's been a problem
22 all along to remedy a mapping error that can be dealt
23 with today. Thank you.

24 MR. HART: Thank you.

25 I didn't get back, Rich, did you want to say

7

1 something additional? Excuse me.

2 MR. DIETZ: Rich Dietz, 615 East Chestnut.
3 My concern again is, you know, I know there's a process
4 to go through and I feel we've followed the process.
5 Financially, when you have raw land, you have what's
6 called an alligator that you're hanging on to. And
7 we've been in this process now for three years.

8 I received a letter from Mr. Christensen
9 approximately 60 days ago that said that we would be
10 dealing with this in 60 days and 60 days is here and
11 now we are getting a new time frame, which we've been
12 getting for the last 3 years, these extended time
13 frames. And we're just asking the commissioners that
14 if it's within their power, which we believe that the
15 mapping error correction is, that they would deal with
16 that and let us get on with our project. Thank you
17 very much.

18 MR. HART: Thank you.

19 Neil Hansen.

20 MR. HANSEN: I'm Neil Hansen, 17648 State
21 Route 9, Mount Vernon.

22 I'm here today to specifically address the
23 agreement with the Friends of Skagit County as it
24 pertains to my property which is designated as Overlook
25 Golf Course in Big Lake. The way this was handled and

8

1 the agreement with the Friends of Skagit County came
2 about I believe is incorrect. My property was named
3 specifically for a down zone. I was never aware of
4 this until it made front page headlines in the Skagit
5 Valley Herald.

6 I did however, I've got some brochures that I
7 handed out, I hope you have that. And I'm just going
8 to follow that a little bit as I go down.

9 I am concerned because within the rural
10 village that is now designated in the Big Lake area, I
11 am specifically exempted to a one lot per five acre
12 zoning. I understand from Gary Christensen, I've
13 talked with him and Tom Karsh and Mike Woodmansee, that
14 this is just an interim thing and everything is going
15 to be taken care of. Well I talked with some folks in
16 the planning department in 1995 and everything was
17 supposed to be taken care of, and here we sit today.
18 So I'm a little leery of sitting back and letting the
19 county take care of it.

20 To give you some background, in 1986 a large
21 portion of my property, my sister's property, H & O
22 Logging property, and the Nookachamps Hills development
23 property was annexed into the Skagit County sewer
24 number 2 district. In 1995 when the Big Lake UGA was
25 drawn, large portions of these properties were deleted

VOL 93 715

9

1 from the sewer district by the County Planning
2 Department. And this is what the gal said at the sewer
3 district today, that they redrew the map and that's the
4 way it's going to be.

5 I wrote letters of protest at that time and
6 pointed out that these properties had been annexed into
7 the sewer district in 1986 and that RUD, water, was
8 sitting within 50 feet of our Hansen property line and
9 should be included in the Big Lake UGA.

10 I believe the boundaries were drawn as a
11 direct result of Friends of Skagit County and Andrea
12 Xavier (phonetic) protesting and filing protests and
13 appeals that you're well aware of, and continues to
14 this date.

15 I have attached a map that I got from the
16 sewer district today that shows the boundaries that
17 were pre-1995, pre-UGA and I'd like to point out a
18 couple things while I'm here that is also errors on the
19 planning department's part. If you look at this map.

20 MR. HART: You need to get back on the tape
21 before you continue, but if you just want to show it.

22 MR. DIETZ: Once again, there has been some
23 errors made in how the property was drawn. I own
24 Overlook Golf Course which is approximately 30 to 35
25 acres that is taken up by the golf course. There is a

10

1 total of probably around 90 acres or so that is in the
2 Rural Village Designation and was in the UGA previous.
3 And that entire property has been exempted to one lot
4 per five acres.

5 Obviously, I'm running out of time and I
6 don't have enough time to say everything I'd like to
7 say. And I hope that I can work with the people from
8 the County to kind of solve this problem. However,
9 I've not been, how can I put it, too well received I
10 guess, and have not been satisfied with the results of
11 this previous things in 1995 when the UGA was drawn, so
12 it's -- I know you people have a tough road to hold
13 with the Friends of Skagit County and all the appeals
14 and everything.

15 And we listen to a lot of business people and
16 property owners today at a meeting are very concerned
17 about the agreement that has been drawn up with the
18 Friends of Skagit County and the problems that you're
19 going to have within the County because of it.

20 I hope that we can work together. Thank you.

21 MR. WOLDEN: Neil, just for a second. The
22 map that you presented here is not the same map that
23 was presented to us as being the map of the sewer
24 district, if that's what you're saying. There is a
25 different map. This was down-sized and --

11

1 MR. HANSEN: Yes, it was down-sized and as I
2 understand it, '95 time frame, somebody told me and I'm
3 not sure who it was, Barbara Rudge (phonetic) was she a
4 member of the Friends of Skagit County, I believe, is
5 that correct, told somebody that we didn't want to be
6 in the Urban Growth Area so they down-zoned the 50
7 acres right next to the Nookachamps Hills Development
8 project, unbeknownst to us. You know, we had no input
9 whatsoever. We're just like now, we don't find out
10 about these things until after the fact, which is a
11 frustrating thing to happen to us.

12 MR. HART: Marianne, did you have anything
13 further?

14 Tom Solberg.

15 MR. SOLBERG: My name is Tom Solberg, I live
16 at 19019 Minnie Road, Burlington. I wanted to have the
17 record show that there's only 11 people here and 3
18 kids. It seems to me it was such an important thing, a
19 big Rural Village, we'd have a better turn out.

20 I believe that this is an attempt to short
21 circuit the proper process. I think we should look
22 into the comp plan and follow chapter 2 of the plan,
23 implementation and monitoring. Chapter 14 community
24 development plans element. And also you can look at
25 the interim or the implementing ordinance on the back

12

1 of the comp plan, it's 16550. And I noted on my letter
2 that, the paragraphs to look at.

3 I really believe that Big Lake needs to
4 submit a subarea plan or a proposal just like the
5 people, as we did in the Alger area, and submitted ours
6 in the 1998 amendments.

7 I'm real surprised, I got the letter today, a
8 memorandum to you dated August 25, 1999. I want to
9 read the part of this, the second paragraph into the
10 record. As part of the development of the UDC and in
11 addressing GMA compliance issues, the Department
12 proposes to reassess the Big Lake Rural Village
13 boundary by applying provisions of ESB 6094, a 1997
14 amendment to the Growth Management Act, the GMA.

15 I knew this was going to happen. I'm a
16 member of the CAC and all of a sudden we are planning
17 to keep going and all of a sudden after doing the
18 commercial industrial we're going to take a month off
19 and we're going to start right on the rural. And I
20 knew something was rotten in Denmark when we never were
21 reconvened again and no hope of ever reconvening it.

22 Where is part of this public participation
23 process that this Growth Management Act should be
24 having? There is none. Now you are going to pick and
25 choose how you want to apply the 6094, and it's totally

VOL 93 716

13

1 wrong. It's just totally wrong.

2 You know that we, a bunch of us people in the
3 rural area, we finally got you to agree to sign an
4 ordinance, I'll call it the seven study areas
5 ordinance, it's number 16853. In that ordinance you
6 promised you would look into changing some RI criteria
7 which is, you all know right now, real strict. It
8 virtually stops anymore RI ever being developed in this
9 county.

10 The association of Skagit County Landowners,
11 in good faith, submitted a proposal for some design
12 criteria changes in the 1998 comp plan. Meanwhile, not
13 to go over the other ground, the CAC was going to be
14 convened to look into the rural residential stuff too.
15 None of this ever happened.

16 I'm beginning to wonder if this is part of an
17 unwritten agreement to the settlement agreement with
18 the Friends of Skagit County, that you would not look
19 into this matter. I'm totally against the settlement
20 agreement. It puts the Friends in the position of
21 dictating policy. I really feel that this is going to
22 be a downfall for some. And I plan on, this deal here,
23 you'll hear from me more on it later. Thank you very
24 much.

25 MR. HART: Thank you Tom.

14

1 Ed Finlan.

2 MR. FINLAN: Yes, Ed Finlan, 18692 Highway 9,
3 Mount Vernon. I'm one of those rare breeds, I'm a Big
4 Lake resident.

5 I don't know all the technical parts of this,
6 I'm not going to go into that. I'm just going to tell
7 you a background of things that occurred to me while
8 I've been out there the last four or five years. I
9 purchased two and a quarter acres on Big Lake. And, my
10 wife and I, we totally intended to subdivide that in
11 the future and that was our retirement. Well, that
12 went by the wayside fairly fast after we bought it.

13 I submitted for a short plat. I wanted four
14 lots, two waterfront and two back lots. I built a home
15 there. I was told I couldn't have that. I had to have
16 eight lots, not four lots under the GMA maximum
17 density. That's what the County told me. I said well,
18 I can't have eight lots, that's an impossibility, on
19 the topography of the land, the landscape, it just
20 doesn't warrant that. With the SEPA, evidently has to
21 be involved in that also with setbacks, and the Class 4
22 drainage ditches now are streams, and the critical
23 areas and whatnot. So it wasn't an impossibility, but
24 I was told that would not go forward because I had to
25 have eight lots.

15

1 I left it in the County because I thought
2 there was a possibility that some things might change
3 in the future. And as a result of that I've got a
4 determination that okay, we can go ahead with the four
5 lots and okay, and at this point I'm one of the
6 fortunate people. And I'm not here for myself because
7 I'm probably vested right now and I don't really have
8 to worry about that too much.

9 But the conditions and regulations that are
10 being put on us are excruciating. I spent \$60,000 for
11 a new sewer line into my property to service one house.
12 I also spent an additional probably 7 to 10 thousand on
13 surveys and reports to the counties, et cetera, et
14 cetera, which is still ongoing. I understand that I
15 might have some reprieve here shortly, but what I'm
16 trying, I guess what I'm trying to point out to the
17 commissioners here is, I bought this for retirement, my
18 wife has since passed away, she never realized our
19 dream. This was our retirement. I don't even know if
20 I'm going to realize this thing yet.

21 I'm violently opposed to Rural Village. I
22 think it should not be. We have all the facilities
23 there. We have sewer, we have water. And I know the
24 fire district is a concern and I also know that the
25 police department is a concern. Although Sedro Woolley

16

1 and a few other towns around here are predominantly
2 volunteer departments in the fire district and our
3 share of department seems to be doing a pretty good job
4 up there.

5 I would go on to say that the GMA has
6 changed, I guess what I'm getting at is, when I bought
7 it it was four or more per acre. That's what I could
8 have. I've got two and a quarter acres on the water at
9 Big Lake. I went to, I couldn't have that, to eight, I
10 had to have eight lots; which I didn't want, which
11 seemed to me to be ridiculous and we went back the
12 other way. Now I'm back to four lots, my original
13 intention, which are four, nice beautiful lots
14 overlooking the lake, not crowded, whatever.

15 Although to the north of me I've got ten, in
16 the last year I've got ten mobile homes; which is fine,
17 I don't have any problem, I'm not here to dispute.
18 Anybody can build any place they want. I'm really
19 opposed to my property rights being taken away. I'm
20 being told what I can do with my property after I have
21 made substantial investment in this thing. And now, as
22 well as my personal rights, I have nothing to say about
23 anything. And I guess that's one of the things I want
24 to push here tonight. I want something to say and I
25 don't know what's happened here in the County. I've

VOI. 93 717

17

1 been here for 10 years. I don't know what's happening
2 in this County, but for some reason, I have nothing to
3 say. If I don't come here, I don't have a word to say
4 to anybody.

5 And if they choose to do something, that's
6 the end of that. And I talk for a lot of people around
7 Big Lake that I know. We don't want this sort of
8 thing. It was fine the way it was. Why are we
9 changing this? We've had since 1997 to address this
10 issue and I understood it was supposed to have been
11 addressed, and now at the last minute we have an
12 emergency meeting and now it's going to go back to
13 Rural Village.

14 For the record, I'm very opposed to that.
15 And, you know, whatever I can do towards slowing that
16 down or overturning that, I will certainly do and
17 that's why I'm here tonight. I'm a little concerned
18 about us, the people out there of Big Lake. We've had,
19 heard testimony here from how many residents of Big
20 Lake? One so far. And I'm a little disappointed in
21 that, that these people aren't here testifying. I
22 thought we'd have a packed room.

23 Anyway, I'm going to go on to that and forget
24 about a lot of this stuff. I think the density now as
25 was stated earlier is heavier than the Rural Village

18

1 allocates anyway. I mean, what's out at Big Lake?
2 There's not much left. I've probably got the biggest
3 land on Big Lake right now that's developable. So, I
4 mean there's not much left around the perimeter road.

5 And I'm going to wrap this up with I don't
6 agree with the Friends of Skagit County agreement. And
7 I'm saying that because, I don't necessarily disagree
8 with all their ideas, but I do disagree with our
9 commissioners making an agreement with a special
10 interest group that puts me to the sidelines. My voice
11 isn't here anymore. And I'm going to say what about
12 us -- the voters, the taxpayers, the whatever? We need
13 to be addressed, we need to have somebody up there
14 talking about us in this Rural Village thing, it's just
15 two years late. It shouldn't be there, it should not
16 be there.

17 I'm not opposed to my neighbors building next
18 to me, and I have two lots next to me, they're 8200
19 square feet and I'm not opposed to that, that's fine.
20 Everybody has to live, and the second thing you're
21 going to do is you're going to take us from four lots
22 per acre down to one lot per acre. And that's going to
23 raise the cost of people that would like to build a
24 home, and as you well know, you're going to shove us
25 all into Mount Vernon and Mount Vernon is doing nothing

19

1 about affordable lots for affordable housing, which is
2 kind of a joke in our industry anymore.

3 But anyway, having said that, I'll just leave
4 that and just so you know, for the record, I am opposed
5 to the Friends of Skagit County and I'm opposed to the
6 Rural Village. And I think the commissioners need to
7 address the citizens and the property owners.

8 And I'll go on to, I'm cleaning up that lake,
9 by the way, and I did testify about that. And I was
10 real upset that the property owners and the boat launch
11 gets to pay for that. Because I see all these jet skis
12 and boats and everything coming out there that are not
13 paying. And the 50 some lots or 44 shares they had in
14 the boat launch does not cover it. I'm a property
15 owner and I've got to put up with that and clean it up
16 for somebody else, and I don't like that either.

17 Anyway, thank you very much.

18 MR. HART: Thank you.

19 MR. WOLDEN: Thank you.

20 MR. HART: Rick Anderson.

21 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, Rick Anderson, formerly
22 of 18785 West Big Lake, currently our Post Office Box
23 is 1976, Mount Vernon. We currently sold our property
24 in June, and the lot, we only were selling half, we
25 boundary line adjust the remainder property to a family

20

1 relative.

2 I dropped off a letter at the commissioner's
3 office on Friday. And the situation I now have, when I
4 go in August to divide the property, that we can no
5 longer divide the property. So I've given property to
6 a relative, we're planning to build, we're living with
7 relatives in the interim while we got the permits, and
8 we've been shut down. And so I need some help there if
9 that's possible to be able to go ahead and divide that
10 off, it's approximately 24 or 23 thousand square feet.

11 I do have to agree with the gentleman prior
12 to myself that the Big Lake area has been kind of
13 shortchanged in that for years the area between West
14 Big Lake Boulevard and the highway was a lower density
15 or lower lot size requirement in square footage. And
16 I'd like to see that area return to what it was before
17 and then go ahead, if the commission so chooses, to put
18 the one acre in the surrounding area but not the
19 perimeter area around the lake. Thank you.

20 MR. HART: Thank you.

21 Wayne Crider.

22 MR. CRIDER: Good evening. I'm really a
23 foreigner. I live at 1026 Northwest Kitsap Terrace in
24 Oak Harbor. But I'm also the executive officer for the
25 Skagit and Island Counties' Builders Association.

VOI 93 718

21

1 And I'm kind of concerned about what's going
2 on, and listening to the last two gentlemen speak, I
3 think what I have written is kind of to the point.
4 I'll limit my comments to those areas that pertain to
5 the Big Lake issue, but understand that I might
6 probably mention other areas but I will tie it together
7 at the end.

8 I represent over 300 businesses in Skagit and
9 Island Counties who employ over 4000 workers. This is
10 just a tip of the iceberg when discussing various
11 entities and residents of Skagit County alone.

12 It is beyond me why the County wants to allow
13 a special interest group to dictate policy for the
14 County. I'm specifically referring to the agreement
15 with Friends of Skagit County, but will only address
16 those areas that pertain to the Big Lake area. Yes,
17 Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board
18 remanded the proposed Big Lake IUGA back as invalid,
19 and required an alternative designation. That was some
20 time ago, and I don't know what's happened between then
21 and between now.

22 Rural Village, while it is something, is not
23 acceptable. Nor is it acceptable to allow the zoning
24 to fall within the rural designation since that would
25 also severely stifle any development, good or bad, in

22

1 that area.

2 In 1997, our state lawmakers passed
3 legislation that allows for RAID or Rural Areas of
4 Intense Development. Island County incorporated and
5 submitted some 46 proposed RAID's when they submitted
6 their plan and development regulations together. The
7 Hearings Board only found nine of those RAID's invalid.
8 Those have been refined and resubmitted. RAID's would
9 allow densities similar to urban areas. And since the
10 infrastructure is at Big Lake, I would encourage you to
11 look at that.

12 The precedence has been set, in reality
13 Skagit County has no comprehensive plan until it is
14 approved and totalled by the Hearings Board, so this
15 option should be open for use by Skagit County also.

16 It appears that staff has only recently
17 explored this legislation as an option for Big Lake or
18 any other areas in the County. And I at first had
19 never written down, but I heard the gentleman talk this
20 evening that said that he got a letter that you guys
21 had looked at that, Gary.

22 The County is not using the latest
23 legislation available to provide for those areas of the
24 County that already exist and are beyond the
25 constraints of zoning proposed for approval in the

23

1 comprehensive plan. Big Lake is already more densely
2 populated than is allowed under the Rural Village
3 Designation, and certainly deserves notoriety and
4 designation that recognizes this fact.

5 Does that mean that there can be no further
6 building done at Big Lake? Or does this mean that if a
7 home burns down or is damaged in a way to render it
8 uninhabitable, it cannot be replaced? I would imagine
9 that will be where the next suggestion comes from.

10 Everything I have seen including the
11 agreement and correspondence between Friends of Skagit
12 County and Skagit County leans toward the radical side
13 of environmental protection disregarding the laws that
14 are in place designed to allow for needed development
15 and growth as mandated by GMA.

16 We are not anti-environmentalist advocates
17 either. All we would like is a balance of issues,
18 opinions, and agreements considered for any law that
19 effects so many people, rather than a knee jerk to the
20 demands of a few.

21 Just to let you know, my yard over in Oak
22 Harbor, is a state designated wildlife sanctuary, and I
23 live in one of the busiest parts of Oak Harbor, right
24 across the street from the high school. So I am
25 environmentally friendly, to a point.

24

1 As I mentioned earlier, everything coming
2 from the staff is almost verbatim the suggestions
3 provided by Friends of Skagit County. It appears the
4 staff does not have any innovative ideas that are well
5 within the scope of the law that will enable them to
6 come up with a fair and equal plan for all citizens of
7 Skagit County.

8 Before you allow a special interest group,
9 along with staff who will not do the research for
10 alternatives or do not know how to do the research, to
11 force this designation down the throats of citizens of
12 Big Lake and Skagit County, I would ask that you
13 instruct staff to do the research for all
14 possibilities, and then make your decision based on
15 what is best for the County, not what is demanded by a
16 few.

17 Another area that will affect the Big Lake
18 issue is the critical areas ordinance. I watched a
19 program the other night on TWV where a spokesperson
20 from Weyerhaeuser was talking about an agreement that
21 they have reached with the Department of Ecology and
22 the State that allows 50 foot buffers rather than 200
23 foot buffers from areas like that. But these buffers
24 have to be of various densities and intensities. Why
25 can't we look at that instead of a 200 foot buffer as

VOL 93 719

25

1 requested by Friends of Skagit County and staff?

2 You should consider Big Lake as a RAID, Rural
3 Area of Intense Development, and then turn your sights
4 on the other areas that were found invalid in Skagit
5 County and adjust the comprehensive plan in such a way
6 that everyone in the County is adequately represented.
7 Instruct staff to do their jobs rather than accepting
8 outside information, carte blanc, and incorporating it
9 into documents for approval. Thank you.

10 MR. HART: Thank you.

11 Dan Mitzel.

12 MR. MITZEL: My name is Dan Mitzel, I live at
13 16533 Walking M Lane. Most of you know that I've been
14 involved for a number of years with the Nookachamp
15 Hills project which is, according to the map attached
16 to the information I picked up on the way in, is part
17 of the proposed Rural Village Designation. It always
18 has been a part of the Big Lake Independent Urban
19 Growth Area.

20 I have a few points. First of all, regarding
21 the sewer district, the sewer district, about a year
22 ago, did an update on their capital facilities plan and
23 came up with a new rate structure for connections to
24 the sewer based on a number of assumptions. One of
25 those assumptions was that the area within the sewer

26

1 part of the old H & O Logging holdings. There was a
2 total of 90 acres that was part of the sewer district
3 at the time that our project was approved that was
4 originally going to be part of the Urban Growth Area.
5 That was taken out. I'm not quite sure why, but it was
6 removed, and Neil Hansen's 50 acre piece and Peggy
7 Hinton's 40 acre piece were taken out.

8 MR. WOLDEN: By whom?

9 MR. MITZEL: The map was changed, I'm not
10 sure why, it was changed.

11 The interesting thing, if you look back at
12 the history of the sewer district formation, H & O
13 Logging and MB Associates, which at that time consisted
14 of my partners in the Nookachamp Hills project, The
15 Larson Brothers, and predecessor to that was McIntyre's
16 (phonetic), contributed the land for the sewer
17 district, and on the last day that the sewer district
18 had to put money together for the construction of the
19 plan, in terms of matching money that the grant funding
20 was available, wrote a check. And in exchange for
21 writing that check, we were assured that they would
22 have connections to their property.

23 Now H & O Logging, at that time, only had a
24 small part of their property that was considered to be
25 part of the sewer district, or the future, potential

28

1 district's boundaries, at that point, would be
2 developed over time and there would be need for
3 connections for homes in that boundary area. And that
4 in order to accommodate that growth, that they were
5 going to have to raise their fee substantially. It
6 went from about \$1100 up to \$3100 and they recently had
7 another increase of about 500 some bucks, so about 3600
8 bucks now to hook up to the sewer out in the Big Lake
9 area.

10 They did this before the Nookachamp Hills
11 project was approved for good reason. They felt The
12 Nookachamp Hills should pay for its fair share of the
13 expanded facilities that would be needed for the
14 further development of the Big Lake area. Presently
15 there are roughly 285 connections left in terms of
16 existing capacity at the sewer district. The
17 Nookachamp Hills project would have used up close to
18 like 85 percent of that, so it was only wise that they
19 raise the fees to us, and in fact make us pay our fees
20 up front, so they would have some money for those
21 needed expansions in planning.

22 We also, when our project was approved, were
23 required to design it, with keeping in mind the
24 adjacent properties to the south, primarily the Hansen
25 property and the piece owned by Peggy Hinton, that was

27

1 sewer district, actually the boundaries hadn't been
2 totally agreed to yet. But they paid that money in
3 good faith. And that was so that they knew that they
4 were contributing to a badly needed solution to a water
5 quality issue on Big Lake, and that there would be
6 further development potential on their property. I
7 think to take that away, by way of, first of all,
8 amending the map and taking their property out, and
9 then now adding insult to injury, by saying that,
10 instead of an Independent Urban Growth Area, we're
11 going to have a Rural Village, is wrong.

12 I just think it's something that needs to be
13 corrected. I think that the way to correct it, I'm one
14 of those people that feels, I don't like getting up and
15 griping about something if I don't have a solution. I
16 think the solution is that the County and you
17 commissioners need to immediately appoint a subarea
18 planning group that is made up of residents in the Big
19 Lake area who have an interest in the long-term
20 livability of that area, get a subarea plan going, look
21 at this possibility of a Rural Area Intensive
22 Development designation. That may be one part of a
23 solution.

24 But to go backwards now and designate this
25 Rural Village after the planning that's been done by

VOL 93 720

29

1 the sewer district for additional growth in that area,
2 is just not the way to go, it's a step backwards.

3 Big Lake is going to grow. There are
4 constraints, there are critical area type constraints,
5 dealing with slopes and wetlands and other things that
6 will control density. If I had a crystal ball, I would
7 say the density out there is probably on an average,
8 when you take into the overall areas that will be
9 unbuildable, be closer to one unit per half acre versus
10 maybe four units per acre. So, two units per acre is
11 probably how it will shake out based on the critical
12 areas we're dealing with in that area.

13 I think the Nookachamp Hills project is
14 indicative of that. We have 201 acres and 252 lots. I
15 think that kind of development, where the densities are
16 approaching, you know, half to one acre type densities,
17 is going to be appropriate for other properties that
18 should be within this Independent Urban Growth Area,
19 namely the Hansen property and Peggy Hinton's property.

20 The Friends of Skagit, I want to talk about
21 that a little bit. I think the Big Lake area has been
22 one of, frankly it's kind of sour grapes for them.
23 They fought us tooth and nail on the Nookachamp Hills
24 project. I spent over \$106,000 on legal fees defending
25 my property rights on that project and two years of

30

1 should happen out in this area and here's our
2 suggestions on how we can solve this problem for the
3 future of Big Lake.

4 This was talked about three years ago, about
5 setting up a subarea plan for that area. And I think
6 that is the thing that needs to happen now. Maybe that
7 means that we leave things alone for now, go back to
8 the Growth Hearings Board and say, look, we'd like to
9 set up a subarea plan for this area and take a look at
10 some of the other options that are available based on
11 later legislation, some of the stuff like the Rural
12 Area of Intensive Development, and come up with
13 something that is going to work for the majority of the
14 residents out in that area.

15 But taking a step backwards and going back to
16 Rural Village is not the answer. It's going to create
17 a lot more headaches for the County than it's going to
18 solve. Thank you.

19 MR. HART: Thank you. That's the end of my
20 list. Does anyone else wish to speak?

21 Marianne.

22 MS. MANVILLE-AILLES: I'm Marianne
23 Manville-Ailles, and I'm going to make a few comments
24 on behalf of the Association of Skagit County
25 Landowners. The Association represents roughly 300

32

1 legal battles. And the end result was that the
2 Superior Court Judge in Snohomish County, Judge
3 Ellendorfer (phonetic) ruled in our favor.

4 And he had a very good decision. If you go
5 back and read that decision and look at what his
6 reasoning was, I think that that same reasoning carries
7 forward into the rest of the development in the Big
8 Lake area. You have sewer, you have water, you have
9 infrastructure in the way of roads. Highway 9's
10 capacity is well below any kind of threshold where it
11 has a level of service problem. I think that it's a
12 desirable area for people to live. I think it's one
13 that, if there were any area in the County that meets
14 the criteria of an Independent Urban Growth Area or a
15 Rural Area of Intense Development, it is the Big Lake
16 area. I can't think of another area in the County that
17 has the table set, so to speak, as Big Lake does in
18 terms of those facilities.

19 I believe that getting an independent group,
20 I shouldn't say independent, but a group of people who
21 are Big Lake residents that have a vested interest in
22 what happens out there, should be the ones that come
23 back to you people, and say we've spent the last two or
24 three months going through this, meeting on it, looking
25 at what our options are, and this is what we think

31

1 Skagit County families, many of them in the Big Lake
2 area. We are also, like many of the people who have
3 spoken tonight, opposed to this element agreement that
4 was reached with The Friends of Skagit County.

5 And in terms of the Big Lake Rural Village,
6 believe that the staff needs to go back and take a hard
7 look at this and see if it does not meet the criteria
8 for a rural area, or if it is in fact an urban area
9 given that there is urban water, urban sewer that have
10 been argued before this Hearings Board, that if sewer
11 is ever anywhere, it's an urban area. So how can on
12 one hand we argue that it's an urban area if it's got
13 sewer, and now to make the Big Lake area a Rural
14 Village?

15 There are also other services, and as Wayne
16 mentioned, the fact that we've got so many
17 nonconforming lots in this Rural Village. What happens
18 to those lots when in fact there is tragedy and that
19 house burns down or something. How is that going to be
20 handled? We would request that you give serious
21 consideration to the idea of the RAID's and perhaps
22 looking at an option for something in the order of half
23 acres lots to make it more consistent with what is out
24 there right now. Thank you.

25 MR. HART: Thank you. Is there anyone else

VOL. 93 721

33

1 wishing to speak? Tom.

2 MR. SOLBERG: Can I just say one word?

3 My name is Tom Solberg, 19019 Minnie Road. I
4 do think that, it's in my letter too, that the best use
5 of Big Lake is the UGA. I think this is what should be
6 done, I think we should stick to our guns. Just like
7 Marianne said, if anything else there's going to be a
8 lot of nonconforming lots. You take on the east side
9 of that lake, boy, there's little, teeny lots. And I
10 do think with the water and sewer and everything is set
11 up for UGA and I hope they get it. Thank you.

12 MR. HART: Thank you. Neil.

13 MR. HANSEN: Just one more thing. I'd like
14 to thank these gentlemen over here, they're much more
15 eloquent than I am as far as stating what should happen
16 to my property. Thank you.

17 MR. HART: Ed.

18 MR. FINLAN: I'd just like to make one
19 comment. I'd like to request or consider anyway, the
20 commissioners, that we extend the comment period to
21 like Friday for some written comment. I know there's
22 not enough people here, and I'm really concerned about
23 that. So I would just put that before you.

24 I'm sorry, I'm Ed Finlan, 18692 Highway 9,
25 Mount Vernon.

34

1 I'd like to possibly see that happen if
2 that's possible. Thank you.

3 MR. HART: If there's no one further, we will
4 close the --

5 MR. WOLDEN: Do you want to me to make a
6 motion? I'll make a motion that we close the public
7 hearing. I think also at this time our intent was to
8 close it to written comment as of this particular time,
9 but I don't know that that's absolutely a necessity.
10 Let's leave is open until Wednesday at 4:30 for written
11 comment. That gives you two days and that'll certainly
12 give you the time to take care of that.

13 So I'll move we close the public hearing
14 first and then we'll deliberate as to where we're
15 going. How's that?

16 MR. HART: Okay, I'll second that motion.
17 All in favor of the motion to close the public hearing
18 say Aye.

19 MR. WOLDEN: Aye.

20 MR. HART: Aye.

21 The motion passes.

22 MR. WOLDEN: And I will add that we do keep
23 it open until, we do keep the comment period open until
24 4:30 on September 15, 1999.

25 MR. HART: And I will second that. There's a

35

1 motion to allow public written testimony to come in
2 until 4:30 on Wednesday, September 15th. All in favor
3 say Aye.

4 MR. WOLDEN: Aye.

5 MR. HART: Aye.

6 Motion passes. That'll give time for the,
7 getting all the written testimony back to the
8 commissioners, and also hopefully we can get the
9 transcript so that Commissioner Anderson can read that.

10 With that, we will be considering this, as I
11 mentioned earlier, next Monday at 10:15. Thank you.

12 MR. WOLDEN: Thank you.

36

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
2)
3)
4)
5)
6)
7)
8)
9)
10)
11)
12)
13)
14)
15)
16)
17)
18)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)

C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E

I, **ALLEN R. EMERSON**, a Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the public hearing before the Skagit County Board of Commissioners was reported in a verbatim manner stenographically before me and reduced to typewritten form under my direction;

I further certify that the public hearing before Skagit County Board of Commissioners is a full true and correct transcript of the proceedings reported by me.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my Official Seal this _____ day of _____, 1999.

NOTARY PUBLIC in and for the State of Washington, residing at Sedro Woolley. My Commission expires 6/27/2000.