

**SKAGIT COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2001**

- *T 9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. Board of Health – Peter Browning, Director
1. Flu Vaccine Update
2. Childcare Consultation and Training
3. Welcome Baby
4. Miscellaneous
- *T 10:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. Parks, Recreation and Fair – Bob Vaux, Director
1. Northern State Recreation Area
2. Recreation Programming Update
3. Project Updates
 A. Swinomish Channel Boat Launch
 B. Stan Poppe Field Renovation
 C. Howard Miller Steelhead Park
- *T 10:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. Public Hearing – Edison Sub-Area Clean Water District 2002 Proposed Rate Changes
- 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 a.m. Commissioners' Work Break
- 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Appeal by Donald M. Caldwell of the Hearing Examiner's Decision (PL01-0737)
- 2:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. Commissioners' Work Break

The Skagit County Board of Commissioners met in regular session on Monday, November 6, 2001, with Commissioners Ted W. Anderson and Don Munks present. Commissioner Kenneth A. Dahlstedt's absence was excused.

BOARD OF HEALTH, Peter Browning, Director

1. Flu Vaccine Update

Sandy Paciotti, Nursing Supervisor for Communicable Diseases, reported that out of twenty different strains of flu, the flu vaccine only prevents three strains of it. The three strains of flu that the vaccine will protect every recipient from this year are Type A Panama, Type A New Caledonia and Type B Victoria. It is strongly recommended that people receive the flu vaccine every year to prevent illness, hospitalization and/or death. The flu virus usually happens between late December through March. The shots can be obtained through a doctor's office, grocery store, pharmacies, various workplaces and the Health Department.

Ms. Paciotti said the flu vaccine companies have been delayed in obtaining FDA approval, which means that less of the vaccine is available at this time. Therefore, guidelines have to be set as to which groups of people the Center of Disease Control recommends the vaccine to first. They are:

- All people 65 years of age and older.
- Residents of nursing homes or other chronic care facilities.
- Adults and children with chronic lung or heart conditions, diabetes, or immunosuppression with a prescription from their physician.
- Children and teenagers on long term aspirin therapy.

- Women in their second and third trimester of pregnancy.

Next in line would be the people in the 50 – 64 year old category, health care workers and household members who care for the above mentioned groups. And finally, when enough vaccine is available, anyone wishing to obtain a flu shot will be immunized late November.

Ms. Paciotti reports that the Health Department is in the process of completing the 65 and older population as well as those with prescriptions both at the Senior Centers and the Health Department. Vaccines are given at the Health Department every Monday, Wednesday and Friday from 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. The immunization hotline number is 419-3315.

Chairman Anderson asked when County employees are expected to get their flu vaccinations.

Ms. Paciotti said the date has been set for Thursday, November 15, 2001 if the vaccine is available. If it is not, coupons will be handed out to employees at the Health Fair on November 15.

2. Childcare Consultation and Training

Donna Gustin and Linda Albert, Public Health Nurses, gave a PowerPoint presentation on Child Care Health Consultation and Provider Training. The Health Department has been providing some level of consultation and training services to local providers for 12 – 15 years. Their efforts have intensified over the past four years due to the Healthy Child Care America Campaign in 1996 and Healthy Child Care Washington in 1997. The current role in child care is on-site health & safety consultation/technical assistance with child care providers, State Training and Registry System (STARS) approved training for child care providers, and college credit for select courses offered through child care resource and referral. The Public Health Nurse role supports the relationships between the caregiver and the parent, the caregiver and the young child and the parent and child. The primary community partners are:

- Child care providers.
- Child care resource and referral.
- Division of child care and early learning.
- Early intervention programs.
- Early childhood educators.
- School Districts.

Ms. Gustin and Ms. Albert spoke about “The Interactive Dance”. It is through this process that children learn how to behave cognitively, developmentally and socially in a mutually responsive way. When they experience a safe, secure base, created by attaching to a trusted caregiver, they are free to move out and explore their environment. Professional care givers can choose to foster growth-promoting exchanges and they can choose to respond positively when a child attempts to communicate or signal distress.

3. Welcome Baby

Meredith Baker, Program Coordinator, Welcome Baby Program, advised that the program began in the fall of 1997. It is a parent education and support program designed to encourage reading to babies. Statistics show that babies hear 60% of what is going on in the last trimester. In Skagit County, every family with a child from birth to age three can participate. Gift books, post-partum hospital visits, quarterly child development newsletters, parent support and education are the essence of the program..

Welcome Baby! Is a collaborative, community project, designed to build healthy families. They maintain links with North Cascades Health council, Affiliated health Services, Island Hospital,

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2001
PAGE NO. 3**

Best PLACE, Early HeadStart, Child Care Resource & Referral, and Kiwanis, which is their main source of funding for gift book purchases.

Ms. Baker states that scientific research in brain development is telling us about the critical importance of parent-infant attachment and about key windows of learning during early childhood. Reading to babies is simply one way to build language skills, enrich and enjoy the experience of parenting. Welcome Baby! assumes all parents care about their children and want what is best for them. Whether one is a reader or not, parents are encouraged to talk and sing with their babies in whatever their native language is. It is also an educational model for professionals and practitioners. They provide staff development and training for a number of community agencies and individuals with topics such as: parent-infant attachment, the language of relationship, mental health in children and language development and early literacy.

4. Miscellaneous

There were no miscellaneous items.

PARKS, RECREATION & FAIR, Bob Vaux, Director

1. Northern State Recreation Area

Bob Vaux, Parks Director, thanked the Board for attending the Northern State Recreation Area (NSRA) Charette Kick-Off Dinner and Community Celebration. He said their support means a lot to the success of this regional park project, and their presence as a County Commissioner helped energize their planning and design process. He also thanked Sedro Woolley Mayor Sharon Dillon and the Sedro Woolley Rotary and Soroptimist Clubs for hosting the event, providing the necessary meeting rooms, and for the food that was served. He also thanked the business donors of the door prizes.

Mr. Vaux said correspondence summarizing the Charette weekend would be distributed sometime in the next few weeks. The NSRA Core Planning Group will begin to discuss and strategize the process for county-wide community approval, project priorities, funding and a master plan approval process. He also said Patrik Dylan is currently working on a design map that will be accompanied by a report by the Parks Services Department.

Chairman Anderson said he really appreciated all of the efforts that were put into making the Charette weekend a success. He said that every interested party who came to the event communicated well with each other and responded to the same goals of people working together.

2. Recreation Programming Update

Dennis Lind, Recreation Manager, advised the Board that the softball season is wrapping up for the season. They had a total of 51 leagues, which was an all time high. He said the Clear Lake recreation area brought in \$29,600, which is also a record for that site. Mr. Lind said the water circulators and new slides that were installed this summer had a huge impact on the number of visitors they had. The fall recreation programs are beginning and, as always, obtaining facility space is always a challenge. Mr. Lind mentioned the upcoming community enrichment programs that Lauren Woodmansee is responsible for. What has been offered thus far has been very well received.

**3. Project Updates:
A. Swinomish Channel Boat Launch**

Patrik Dylan, explained to the Board that the boat launch project is officially breaking ground next Monday, November 12, 2001. The first phase will be the upland/restroom work and the work will be confined to a small fenced off area of the parking lot. The boat launch will remain fully open and operational at this point. The in-water work is expected to start in late December or early January when tides are at their lowest. The boat launch will be closed at this point for between 4 and 8 weeks, depending on the weather. Once the exact dates are determined, Mr. Dylan said that this information would be communicated to the public via newspaper and radio press releases, county web site listings, and site signage.

B. Stan Poppe Field Renovation

Mr. Dylan said the Poppe Field renovation will be finished this month, including the drainage system. Other work being done by the Parks crew will be completed as well.

C. Howard Miller Steelhead Park

Mr. Vaux explained that ground breaking took place yesterday and that Earl Dierking, Assistant Parks Department Director, would be acting as the lead person on this project. The Parks crew is currently working on the electrical aspect of the project along with moving the well system over to Public Utilities District (PUD) water. A Resolution and Interlocal with PUD will be forthcoming.

Chairman Anderson said he continues to hear compliments on the Howard Miller Steelhead Park.

PUBLIC HEARING – EDISON SUB-AREA CLEAN WATER DISTRICT 2002 PROPOSED RATE CHANGES

Alison Mohns, Planning & Permit Center, said a public meeting was held on October 2, 2001 at 7 p.m. at Edison School. The Edison Sub-Area Advisory Town Board met to discuss the funding options and operating budget for the year 2002. After a lot of discussion and public comment, they voted to support, for all customer classes, an increase of 30%. The residents received a public hearing notice notifying them of a 30% increase across the board for both residential and commercial accounts.

Chairman Anderson opened the public hearing.

Nancy Ivarinen, 816 Fairhaven Avenue, Burlington, stated that she was representing the Mr. Calomino, owner of the Edison Tavern, who was unable to be present. He strongly objects to the fact that the Edison Sub-Area Advisory Board is not duly constituted. If you look at the charter, it does not appear that the members have adopted any by-laws and that the current members of the board no longer represent the positions for which they were appointed. He objects to the board as it is currently constructed and run. Although this concern is not a subject of the budget, he feels the deficiency should be corrected.

Ms. Ivarinen said the primary objection that Mr. Calomino has is a proposal that businesses will only be allowed one pumping per year. Mr. Calomino objects to the disparate treatment of businesses. There is concern that there is no provision in the budget for commercial grease trap pumping. She thinks it would be prudent for the sewer district to pay for more than one pumping and also to pump the grease traps in order that the system not be impacted by people failing to

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2001
PAGE NO. 5**

comply with that quite reasonable requirement. Not pumping the grease trap could seriously impact the functioning of the system.

Mr. Calomino also objects to a management salary consisting of 40% of the budget. He believes that management is not necessary. The system is up and running and Skagit County is available for technical expertise. She said she believes the Board of County Commissioners, according to the provisions, shall retain ownership and shall be responsible for the management of the facility. A management company is being paid over \$1,000 a month to advise the board and the proposed budget also has that provision in it. Ms. Ivarinen said she attended an advisory board meeting and learned that the function of the manager that was hired for this particular meeting was to put out a newsletter. He didn't offer anything in the area of technical expertise and she was appalled that money for the sewer district would be used to fund an engineer to put out a newsletter. The Board should have been able to do that.

Mr. Calomino also wonders why it is necessary to spend money for contractors to test the system on a quarterly schedule, since it has been shown, after two years, that pumping is still not necessary at this time.

Ms. Ivarinen asked that the Board of County Commissioners take a careful look at the Boards' recommendations because they are not a duly constituted board and also the impact the management company has had in regard to making these recommendations. She was in the meeting when they were discussing their budget and what they would pay the management company to remain on board. The person who was from the management company was there and he did not recuse himself, took part of the discussion and she believes it was incredibly improper.

Doris Robbins, Edison, recommends the Board's approval on the budget proposal that the advisory committee presented last week. They are a volunteer group who represents the community as a whole. They feel they have come up with an equitable solution to the problem. Ms. Robbins states that the new budget is an interim budget as more testing still has to be done. It is a very bare bones budget and she reminded the Board that the project is a national model of what a community can do to cooperate with state and county agencies.

Ms. Robbins said many of the complaints that have been made about the decisions need to be further analyzed. She is a commercial site owner as well as a resident, so she will be paying both rates. Another question that came up was budgeting for a manager's salary. Ms. Robbins said she used to do the job for free and she is truly impressed with the gentleman who is now performing management duties. She said the district needs a strong manager because it is a complicated issue and they need to keep on top of everything including all of the mandates that are required to fulfill all of the time. The person being paid is not an engineer.

Chairman Anderson requested any written materials be submitted by tomorrow.

Commissioner Dahlstedt asked Ms. Robbins if she has been attending the meetings.

Ms. Robbins said she has attended meetings for the last four months and she has been trying to spread the word about the controversy between the commercial and residential rates.

Ron Palmer, Health Department, reports that there is disagreement as to how the rate structure should be adopted, with a major split between residential and commercial. This is an interim proposal and they are currently working on rules and regulations that should cement these in concrete. Currently working under interim guidelines. There is 1.5% difference in this proposal in the commercial establishments. If you look at any sewer district or any municipality the rate structures are usually different for commercial than they are for residential. He feels the 1.5% is fair and at the last meeting the restaurants that participated didn't seem to object. One of the

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2001
PAGE NO. 6**

questions that came up is why if the system has been working for two years, why do they continue to monitor and sample. Mr. Palmer explained that with any sewer system which is a biological system that is not steady and is subject to change, monitoring and maintenance needs to be done to insure it continues to function as it was designed. Some of the testing is to determine what the load is from restaurants as opposed to the residences.

Commissioner Dahlstedt asked how many homes are involved the system. Mr. Palmer reports there are 62 homes and 72 connections, which include the schools that have a block of ten connections themselves. There are three commercial food establishments, one art gallery and one bakery.

Commissioner Munks motioned to close the public hearing. Commissioner Dahlstedt seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chairman Anderson said he would like to delay the decision until November 19, 2001 at 11:15 a.m.

APPEAL BY DONALD M. CALDWELL OF THE HEARING EXAMINER'S DECISION (PI01-0737)

Linda Kuller, Senior Planner for the Planning & Permit Center, gave an overview of the events that have happened to date. On May 21, 2001, a Notice of Appeal of administrative interpretations, decisions and actions was submitted by Donald Caldwell. The appeal addressed code interpretations rendered in Code Enforcement Case No. CE00-0203. The Appellant is an adjoining land owner to Ms. Donna Butler whose property has been investigated for nuisance related complaints. One of those complaints was that there are two homes on the property. The Notice of Appeal indicates that the Appellant was aggrieved by the failure of the Planning and Permit Center to abate the nuisances on the Butler property. The Notice of Appeal also states various faults with staff interpretations related to complaints lodged against Ms. Donna Butler. The staff found that the two homes on the property were non-conforming because they were put there prior to the establishment of zoning and building codes. One of them will be considered of non-conforming use under today's provisions because only one principal building is allowed per lot. The remedy sought was to reverse staff decisions and to find that the Appellant's complaints constitute violations of Skagit County Code Title 14 and are detriments to the public health, safety and welfare and are public nuisances pursuant to SCC 14.44.010(1). The Appellant also stated that the Hearing Examiner should order the Permit Center to "abate by any lawful means" said violations.

On June 27, 2001, Wick Dufford, Hearing Examiner, called for briefs on the question of jurisdiction to hear the subject appeal which was characterized as a request for an Administrative Interpretation.

On July 19, 2001, Brad Furlong, P.S., Attorney for Appellant Donald Caldwell, submitted a request to place that appeal in abeyance and supplement the original appeal through submittal of a second (alternative) Notice of Appeal which questioned compliance with the conditions of a variance permit issued by Hearing Examiner Schofield (V91-027) to Ms. Haley (Donna Butler's mother). This variance was to allow for the subdivision of a parcel of property without meeting the Skagit County Minimum Road Standards. Instead, an existing 40 foot right-of-way was proposed to provide access to the subdivision. This variance was approved with one condition. However, the variance was never utilized to short plat the property.

In response to the Hearing Examiner's call for briefs regarding jurisdiction, a letter dated July 24, 2001 was submitted from Tom Karsh regarding the proper processing and administration of Administrative Decisions and Administrative Interpretations. This letter concluded in part that certain staff actions including code interpretations unrelated to a permit application (such as the

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2001
PAGE NO. 7**

interpretations offered in response to the complaints investigated in CE00-0203) could not be appealed administratively. Ms. Kuller states that the fundamental issue here is that we do not have administrative appeal for staff interpretations on code enforcement cases and staff actions that the appellant claims failed to resolve the complaints lodged by Mr. Caldwell.

Based on the information provided by the parties, the Hearing Examiner issued an Order dated August 6, 2001 dismissing the initial appeal filed on May 21, 2001 as well as the alternative appeal dated July 19, 2001. On August 8, 2001, Brad Furlong, on behalf of his client Donald Caldwell, submitted a Request for Reconsideration of the Hearing Examiner's Order. On September 4, 2001, Hearing Examiner Dufford issued an order denying the Request for Reconsideration.

On September 18, 2001, Appeal No. PL01-0737 was submitted by Donald Caldwell. This appealed the Hearing Examiner's decision (Order Dismissing Appeals dated August 6, 2001 and Order Denying Request for Reconsideration dated September 4, 2001). Appeal PL01-0737 requests that the Board of County Commissioners take action with respect to the violation of Hearing Examiner Schofield's decision or requests that the matter be remanded back to the Hearing Examiner to hold a public hearing and take action as is appropriate pursuant to the provisions of Skagit County Uniform Development Code ("UDC").

Ms. Kuller said staff concurs with the Hearing Examiner's Order dated August 6, 2001. This Order properly addresses the procedural issues raised in the appeal and as procedure dictates, substantive issues of interpretation are not to be considered. According to SCC 14.06.050 (1)(b)(iv) requests to review or interpret a previously issued land use permit that required a Public Hearing are limited to requests from the County or the property owner. The Appellant is a third party and cannot make such a request.

Additionally, the Appellant's request to appeal based on compliance with the conditions of the variance is not relevant since the variance permit specifically allowed the subdivision of a parcel without meeting the Skagit County Minimum Road Standards. A short plat was never filed. Thus, specific conditions related to the variance could not have been violated.

The Appellant's substantive disagreement with staff interpretation of code violations cannot be appealed administratively as indicated in Mr. Karsh's letter to the Hearing Examiner dated July 24, 2001. Based on the analysis stated above, the staff recommends denial of the appeal.

Chairman Anderson opened the appeal hearing.

Brad Furlong, 825 Cleveland Avenue, Mount Vernon, stated that he is the attorney representing Donald Caldwell in this matter. He clarified that this appeal strictly concerns the second appeal that was filed with the Hearing Examiner and has nothing to do with the staff interpretation or any decision by the Planning Department to take or not take enforcement action.

Hearing Examiner Dufford has made a lot of good decisions, but in this case he has made an error. There is a new code with a number of provisions that need to be determined and, ultimately, it is up to the Board of County Commissioners to define the jurisdiction of the Hearing Examiner. He stated that it should be plain after today's hearing that he does have jurisdiction and is required to hear this matter.

Mr. Furlong then reviewed the parcels Mr. Caldwell owns, noting that there are three separate dates that established easement rights through the Butler property. The issue is the application of SCC code 14.060.050(1)(b). It says that the Hearing Examiner has jurisdiction to hear a request from the County or an owner to review and interpret a previous land use permit that required a public hearing by any county entity including but not limited to, etc.

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2001
PAGE NO. 8**

In 1991 Hearing Examiner Robert Schofield issued a variance decision with respect to the Butler property, where he allowed the owner to subdivide property and use 40' of the access road. The only variance that was given was that they could use a 40' right of way. Otherwise, Mrs. Haley was required to comply with the subdivision ordinance and short subdivision road standards. The matter that was brought before Hearing Examiner Dufford was the compliance with those conditions.

The Hearing Examiner needs to hold a hearing about whether Ms. Butler has complied with those provisions set forth in Hearing Examiner Schofield's order. The code section read earlier gives the right to the owner to review and interpret a provision. He then referred to the term "owner" in 14.04.020 and quoted the code. He stated that it does not limit the definition of an owner to someone who was an applicant or recipient of a permit. It is anyone with a legal interest in the property.

The conclusion is that Mr. Caldwell by virtue of the easement does have an interest in the property. Under the definition in the code he is an owner. Mr. Furlong compared the present situation to a situation in La Conner, where he is the city attorney. If the Commissioners rule against his client, it would make an easement the Town of La Conner has through a property null and void.

After further reviewing the kinds of issues that could go through the Hearing Examiner, Mr. Furlong stated that it is clear that the type of hearing requested by Mr. Caldwell is within the Hearing Examiner's jurisdiction.

Relative to the staff comments, he is in disagreement with what the variance did. The reason they are requesting this hearing before the Hearing Examiner is that they firmly believe that Ms. Butler's use of two residences on a single lot of record violates the ordinance. The issue on this date is what the jurisdiction of the Hearing Examiner is. He stated that he is requesting that Mr. Caldwell, as a property owner in Skagit County, be given his day before the Hearing Examiner. "He has the right to go before the Hearing Examiner and be heard." He noted that there are no questions from Mr. Caldwell.

Chairman Anderson asked if the opposing attorney was present and wished to speak.

Mrs. Butler explained that he was unable to be present, as the date of the hearing had been changed. She said it was her understanding that no new information could be provided.

Chairman Anderson clarified that this is a closed record appeal and no further evidence can be entered into the record.

John Moffat of the Prosecuting Attorney's Office, Civil Division, asked Mr. Furlong if his argument that Mr. Caldwell is an owner by definition of the code was raised with the Hearing Examiner?

Mr. Furlong said that it was.

Linda Kuller stated that Ms. Haley applied for and received a variance from the County that provided the condition that if she wished to activate the variance permit she would have to follow the rules and regulations, including other new county road standards and requirements. It wasn't directing her to short plat her property.

Mr. Furlong said he thinks the issue staff is raising at this point is a substantive argument and his response is simple. In Hearing Examiner Schofield's decision he allowed Ms. Haley to use a substandard roadway for access to more than one family residence. In that variance he specifically stated that Ms. Haley was to adhere to the Skagit County short subdivision ordinance. By occupying two single-family residences on a single lot of record Ms. Haley and her

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2001
PAGE NO. 9**

predecessors are violating the short subdivision ordinance, and they need to activate that ordinance pursuant to Hearing Examiner Schofield's ruling. None of the rules have been followed. The narrow issue is that Mr. Caldwell is an owner and this is the type of hearing that should be heard before the Hearing Examiner.

John Moffat asked Mr. Furlong if it is his contention that this is a short plat because there are two houses on the property?

Mr. Furlong said it is and that is what the County Code requires.

Mr. Moffat said there were two houses on the property even before the County had zoning. "Doesn't that make one of them a non-conforming use?"

Mr. Furlong said, no, that one of them was abandoned. "Ms. Butler has reoccupied that, I think, in contradiction to the law." But that is something the Hearing Examiner needs to hear and determine.

Donna Butler, 14556 Rosario Road, stated that the only thing she can add is when the Hearing Examiner filled out the paperwork there was a 90-day period. If she did not apply for a short plat in 90 days her opportunity to do so was gone. She did not have the money and didn't apply for a short plat.

Chairman Anderson clarified with Ms. Kuller that there was no short plat application. He then requested that a date be set for the Commissioners to give their decision. He explained that the Commissioners have agreed to schedule a decision after a hearing takes place in order to have time to consider the material.

The date was set for Tuesday, November 13 at 11:30.

Mr. Furlong asked the Commissioners if they would be discussing this with anyone in the County in the meantime?

Chairman Anderson said they would not.

Mr. Furlong asked if there would be any consultations with the Prosecuting Attorney's Office about it?

Chairman Anderson said he couldn't say, but on his part there would not be.

Commissioner Dahlstedt stated that he would be out of town on November 13.

Mr. Furlong asked Mr. Moffat whom he has spoken to about this.

Mr. Moffat said he has spoken to Ms. Kuller in an effort to understand what the appeal is about.

There was further discussion about another date so that Commissioner Dahlstedt can be present.

It was decided that the decision would be made on Tuesday, November 27, 2001 at 2:15 p.m.

John Moffat reminded the Commissioners that under the Code they are limited to three courses of action: 1) remand to the Hearing Examiner; 2) deny and affirm the decision of the Hearing Examiner; or 3) if the Board believes the Hearing Examiner is clearly erroneous the Board may adopt its own signed conclusions and decisions based on the record made by the Hearing Examiner.

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2001
PAGE NO. 10**

"In looking over the Hearing Examiner's decision, both in the decision as well as in the reconsideration denial as pointed out by Mr. Furlong, in both places the Hearing Examiner discusses his interpretation of SCC 14.06.050(1)(b)(4) as to what 'owner' means." He further stated that as Mr. Furlong points out, that is really the crucial issue before the Board", whether Mr. Caldwell, who has easements across the Butler property, is an owner. That is the crucial issue before the Board.

Chairman Anderson stressed that it is very important in those decisions that come down that if the Hearing Examiner decision is overturned, there needs to be findings that are very specific to the record about where he has erred.

Mr. Furlong stated that the remedy they are asking for and that they feel would be appropriate is for the County Commissioners to remand this back to the Hearing Examiner.

Chairman Anderson assured Mr. Furlong that he was clear about this.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Munks motioned to adjourn the proceedings. Commissioner Dahlstedt seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

Ted W. Anderson, Chairman

Kenneth A. Dahlstedt, Commissioner

Don Munks, Commissioner

ATTEST:

JoAnne Giesbrecht, Clerk of the Board
Skagit County Board of Commissioners