

**Consultation Meeting Regarding Land Use  
Near the Skagit Regional Airport (Bayview Ridge Subarea)  
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Aviation Division  
September 18, 2013**

**Participants:** Dale Pernula, Skagit County Planning Director  
Ken Dahlstedt, Skagit County Commissioner  
Sharon Dillon, Skagit County Commissioner  
Ron Wesen, Skagit County Commissioner  
Tim Holloran, Skagit County Administrator  
Sara Young, Port of Skagit Airport Manager  
Alan Anders, Heritage Flight Museum  
Kendal Gentry, Skagit Airport Support Association (SASA)  
Les Smith, Washington Pilots Association  
David Mischke, President of the Board of the SASA  
Tim Rosenhan, SASA  
Carter Timmerman, WSDOT Aviation Division  
Jill Dvorkin, Skagit County Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney  
Ryan Walters, Skagit County Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney  
John Bouslog, Bayview Ridge Property Owner  
Loyd Frazier, Bayview Ridge Property Owner  
Bill Wallace, Burlington-Edison (B-E) School Board  
Laurel Browning, B-E School Superintendent  
Roger Howard, B-E School Board  
Kevin Meenaghan, Skagit County Planning Commission  
Kirk Johnson, Skagit County Senior Planner  
Heather Haslip, Port of Skagit

Dale Pernula: Okay, I think it's ready – time to begin now, so if you have a seat we can begin. I'll introduce myself. My name is Dale Pernula. I'm the Director of the Planning & Development Services Department for Skagit County. And what we're having here today is a consultation regarding potential development near the Skagit County – the Skagit Airport. Well, the purpose of the meeting is to get some input on the proposed revisions to the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan, the Planned Unit Development regulations ordinance and the development standards that are being proposed. There's a lot of people here, and I'd like everyone to go around the room and see who you all are, and begin with that.

First of all, I'm Dale Pernula.

Commissioner Ken Dahlstedt: Ken Dahlstedt, Skagit County Commissioner.

Commissioner Sharon Dillon: Sharon Dillon, Skagit County Commissioner.

Commissioner Ron Wesen: Ron Wesen, Skagit County Commissioner.

Tim Holloran: Tim Holloran, County Administrator.

Sara Young: Sara Young, Port of Skagit – today, probably functionally Airport Manager.

Al Anders: Al Anders, Heritage Flight Museum in Bellingham.

Kendall Gentry: Kendall Gentry with SASA, Skagit Airport Support Association.

Les Smith: Good morning. I'm Les Smith with Washington Pilots Association.

David Mischke: David Mischke, with SASA.

Tim Rosenhan: And I'm Tim Rosenhan. I'm on the SASA Board now. I was formerly Airport Manager at Skagit Regional and an airport planner for a career.

Carter Timmerman: Good morning. I'm Carter Timmerman of the Washington State Department of Transportation Aviation Division.

Jill Dvorkin: I'm Jill Dvorkin with Skagit County Prosecutor's office.

Ryan Walters: And I'm Ryan Walters with the Prosecutor's office, Civil Division. Why don't we start over here and John –

John Bouslog: John Bouslog, property owner at Bayview Ridge.

Loyd Frazier: Loyd Frazier, property owner at Bayview Ridge.

Bill Wallace: Bill Wallace, Burlington-Edison School Board.

Laurel Browning: Laurel Browning, Burlington-Edison Superintendent.

Roger Howard: Roger Howard, Burlington-Edison School Board.

Kevin Meenaghan: Kevin Meenaghan, County Planning Commission.

Kirk Johnson: Kirk Johnson, Skagit County Planning & Development Services.

Heather Haslip: Heather Haslip, Port of Skagit.

Mr. Pernula: Okay, you want to move on to the next slide? Okay, what this is about is RCW 36.70.457 and 36.70A.510 require a formal consultation with airport owners, managers, private airport operators, general aviation pilots, ports, and the Aviation Division of the Washington DOT to address incompatible land uses prior to updating or amendment of comprehensive plans or development

regulations that may affect properties adjacent to a publicly- or privately-owned public use airport. This would include proposed amended policies, land use maps, development regulations or zoning maps that would propose to alter land uses, density or intensity of uses or create high hazard air space obstructions or other similar impacts within an airport influence area of a public use airport.

And as I mentioned before, we are proposing some amendments to the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan, some Planned Unit Development regulations and design standards.

Okay, the Airport Compatible Land Use Program Guidebook provides for the following step 3(c): Following the consultation meeting, the jurisdiction airport or aviation users may request additional information to clarify the project and exchange ideas to avoid, minimize or resolve potential incompatible land use issues or request additional information from the airport and users as needed.

Step 4: During the consultation meeting, all parties will identify issues and concerns regarding the proposal in an effort to reach a consensus on project objectives, project alternatives, modifications, or other specific measures that avoid, minimize or resolve potential incompatible land uses adjacent to the airport. And that's primarily what we're here for today. A local jurisdiction, airport and state should document the consultation process and keep a record of the proceedings. This meeting is being recorded for audio only.

In the new – the proposed amendments to the Subarea Plan, there are more industrial land – there would be more industrial land and less residential. There are some revisions to the Capital Facilities and Transportation chapter, and there some other updates to make the narratives and facts and figures in the Plan current.

The PUD code defines a process through which a developer can apply to do large-scale residential development. Right now there's a moratorium on development with more than four lots and that would be lifted if you go through the PUD process at Bayview Ridge.

Development standards: Rules that shape what new residential and commercial development at Bayview Ridge would look like and how it will function.

What's not changes: There are no changes to the existing Airport Environs Overlay; no changes to allow schools – no changes to allow schools in any new zone; no increase in average density or total allowed residences within the subarea. And we have a number of maps, as well.

With the invitation to this meeting, there was also a packet of information that was – a link to it was provided, and I hope you've all had a chance to look at that information. There is a lot of information there.

As I mentioned, this is a mandatory consultation, open to the public, but it's not a public hearing. It's a meeting where we are seeking information among airport managers, users and the County. And also, in addition to the people who are present, I have online – or on the telephone – John Collins, who is the Aircraft Owners Pilots Association and he's in Frederick, Maryland, right now and he's on the phone.

Mr. Walters: I think the plan is also to produce a transcript of this meeting.

Mr. Pernula: Okay.

Mr. Timmerman: And we will follow up with correspondence confirming that you've met the obligation to consult with WSDOT Aviation.

Mr. Pernula: Okay, so perhaps the best place to start with is with Carter Timmerman with Washington DOT, since he has been through this process in the past, and I'm sure he has some comments to make on our proposal.

Mr. Timmerman: Well, thank you very much, Dale. I really appreciate it, and I want to first compliment you on the packet that you put together. It was exceptional – a fantastic document – and I can say that after seeing a lot of these.

First I'd like to clarify *our* role – WSDOT Aviation's role – to supply technical assistance to local jurisdictions when making amendments to development regulations or comprehensive plans that can affect airports. We provide most of our technical assistance through our Airports and Compatible Land Use Guide, which provides best management practices for local jurisdictions. So we are charged by the same RCW, RCW 36.70.547, with providing that type of assistance and participating in the consultation process.

Dale, just so everyone kind of understands real quick: The first iteration of this had significantly more residential development. How many acres have you switched over for Light Industrial use so everyone kind of has an idea of where some of the amendments that you've made so far?

Mr. Pernula: Can you show that on the map? We've moved the industrial line further to the east to add 110 acres of additional residential – or industrial – use.

Mr. Walters: So the pink is the Light Industrial area. This is the existing land use map. So pink is Light Industrial. Brown up above is Urban Reserve. The green square in the middle is the Community Center zone. So you'll see changes in each of those zones to accommodate the existing industrial. It didn't all come from residential. I'll switch now and try to overlay them like exactly on top of each other so you can see the switch.

Mr. Timmerman: That's fantastic. Ha-ha, okay. So –

Mr. Walters: So BR-URv gets smaller there. You see the brown get smaller. The blue BR-R also gets smaller. It moves farther east. And the BR-CC changes from, I think, 40 acres to more like 7.

Mr. Timmerman: Okay. The Urban Reserve – could you elaborate on – that's to prevent further development in division of lands. Correct, Dale? The Urban Reserve \_\_ designation?

Mr. Pernula: Well, it hasn't become into the Bayview Ridge residential zone yet. It's something for the future.

Mr. Timmerman: Okay. And would that most likely be a residential use or would that be a –

Mr. Pernula: That's the proposal.

Mr. Timmerman: That's the proposal. Okay.

Mr. Walters: Well, I guess that's the existing condition – that it would eventually become residential.

Mr. Timmerman: Okay. Under the current proposal as it stands, how many additional residential units will be added?

Mr. Walters: Probably there won't be any additional residential units added. The proposal – I guess to back up a little bit – is to implement the Subarea Plan. Because the current Subarea Plan projects a total of something like 5600 people at Bayview Ridge – there are currently, I think, around 2,000 – 5600 people by 2025. I think we now project that that timeline gets shifted quite a ways out because we spent ten years doing this process. But as a result of these map changes, you wouldn't see any reduction in population. The same allocated population would still occur somewhere at Bayview Ridge. It just wouldn't occur in that currently blue area. It would probably occur in the brown area. It would be shifted temporally into the future. So the zoning of four to six units per acre in the blue residential area wouldn't change.

Mr. Timmerman: Okay. Under that zoning it allows for a variety of different residential uses. From my recollection it allows for townhouses, it allows for duplexes, it allows for single-family. I didn't see multi-family, which is one of the things that we recommended. Does it allow for a higher density multi-family – allow for a variety of housing choices?

Mr. Walters: Yeah, the PUD code – and anyone else can jump in, too – does provide for especially commercial multi-family housing, and I don't think that's limited to the BR-CC zone, but some of it is envisioned in the BR-CC. BR-CC is supposed to be the town center of the Bayview Ridge Urban Growth Area.

Mr. Timmerman: Okay.

Mr. Walters: So it would allow for commercial. It would *require* commercial adjacent to Peterson and then it would also allow residential in some of the other area of the BR-CC zone. The zone is proposed here at 7 acres but it could be expanded with a PUD application into the existing or the mapped BR-R area.

Mr. Timmerman: That's directly in the approach to the \_\_\_\_ there, correct?

Mr. Walters: Well, I don't know.

Mr. Timmerman: Okay. Airport \_\_\_\_\_. Okay. On my review of the development regulations, I did notice some things that should be addressed. On page – of the packet – 2 of 20, you have metering solar panels as one of the allowed uses, correct?

Mr. Walters: In the packet?

Mr. Timmerman: In the packet that you provided – the consultation packet.

Mr. Walters: In our existing zoning code? Yeah.

Mr. Timmerman: Yes.

Mr. Walters: It's allowed throughout the county.

Mr. Timmerman: Yeah. One of our concerns is that you could have reflective glare from those and your airport overlay might conflict with that allowed use.

Mr. Walters: So you're suggesting that we shouldn't allow solar panels.

Mr. Timmerman: Well, I'm suggesting solar panels would be just fine as long as you make sure that they don't have any reflective qualities to them.

Mr. Walters: Okay.

Mr. Timmerman: Okay?

Mr. Walters: Maybe that's something that could be incorporated into the airport overlay.

Mr. Timmerman: Airport overlay, yes. Or, what you may want to do, is \_\_\_ further throughout the development regulations is reference the airport overlay section.

Mr. Walters: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Timmerman: So also, on page 4 of 20, you have on-site hazardous waste treatment and storage facilities and that would be allowed in your Light Industrial zone. Now my concern after reading that would be this has a potential to be a wildlife attractant. If you have open bodies of water, if you have a waste transfer station where you're moving garbage from one place to another, you have gulls. That would increase the probability of a wildlife strike within the airport operating environment.

Mr. Walters: Which zone is that? Light Industrial?

Mr. Timmerman: That is in your Light Industrial zoning. That would be 4 of 20 of your packet.

Mr. Walters: We do have an existing Skagit County Transfer Station in the *Heavy Industrial* zone, which is the burnt orange.

Mr. Timmerman: I'm going to refer to Sara. Sara's the Airport Manager – I think Airport Manager. Sara, do you have any problem with wildlife strikes or any problems with –

Ms. Young: As a result of the transfer station?

Mr. Timmerman: Yeah.

Ms. Young: No.

Mr. Timmerman: Okay.

Ms. Young: The facility is a new facility and it's covered. It's not something, you know, I would say, a lot of those sorts of concerns are typically handled through the review process. Skagit County's really good about routing project proposals to us for comment, and those are the kind of things we look for – stormwater facilities, long and linear meaning all those wildlife hazards.

Mr. Timmerman: Okay, excellent. I always like to – the more predictability you can provide a developer the better! That's the way I always go about this. Let's see – Ken?

Commissioner Dahlstedt: Maybe just one question, but Isn't it true that the Port was also considering a transfer facility on its own property?

Ms. Young: All of those concerns would have come up, that it would have had to have been enclosed containers

Mr. Walters: Does the same concern extend to just ordinary stormwater?

Mr. Timmerman: We actually have a manual on ordinary stormwater. Currently Ecology's updating their stormwater manual and ours is in the process of being updated. It's equivalent with the Department of Ecology's stormwater manual. So we generally recommend local jurisdictions adopt some of the best management practices found there.

Mr. Walters: Found in Ecology's?

Mr. Timmerman: And ours for water \_\_\_\_\_. A lot of them adopted by reference there \_\_\_\_\_. Typically what you don't want to see is you don't want to see stormwater facilities retain water for over twenty-four hours or forty-eight hours. It's amazing what wildlife will immediately cling onto and turn into habitat.

Mr. Walters: This entire urban growth area is inside our NPDES permit area, so we comply with all of our – all the NPDES permit requirements for this area.

Ms. Young: Can I just – I'm sorry; I had this cell phone distraction. It's so rude –

Mr. Timmerman: Yes, go ahead.

Ms. Young: I think that's an area we need to come back to, maybe not as a part of this consultation but I think you probably might have some point you want to clarify, Carter, that there actually is a separate stormwater management \_\_\_ for airports.

Mr. Timmerman: Absolutely. Yes, there is an entire angle of just on how to do it.

Ms. Young: And it's accepted by the Department of Ecology.

Commissioner Wesen: And so we would do the airport sort of on a manual in this airport environs and not use Ecology's. Is that \_\_\_\_\_?

Mr. Timmerman: Um –

Mr. Walters: I doubt that would be allowed.

Ms. Young: Nothing in regulation is ever so simple, right?

(laughter)



Ms. Young: You have some robust requirements. They're a Phase II under the Municipal Stormwater Permit. So I think it's probably a separate conversation, but something we absolutely want to have with this group.

Mr. Timmerman: So I'd be happy to participate in that and further amend. Let's see. So I would come back to my points. I'm going to let Tim – I'm going to hand it over to Tim now. Tim can provide some input and, Tim, do you want to give a little bit of your background and –

Mr. Rosenhan: Sure. As I said at the beginning, I was Airport Manager at Skagit Regional in the early '80s and I went on to work at Reid Middleton, a northwest planning and engineering firm, where I did airport master planning for a number of years including being the Project Manager on Renton Municipal Airport, NAS Whidbey Island. I did compatible land use studies around NAS Whidbey Island, including their outlying field at Coupeville which is currently in a legal mess.

And I want to back up a bit from kind of the – just from my perspective being an airport manager and doing airport planning. Housing next to airports is a formula for conflict, and I can name several airports in the Pacific Northwest, some of which you're familiar with, where there have been either legal or political conflicts or are currently in those conflicts. The closest one that everyone's familiar with is the Anacortes Airport. That was designed and built concurrently with the Skyline residential development in Anacortes. In the 1980s there was a proposed runway extension which raised the political concern of people who lived adjacent to the airport in Skyline, and resulted in them basically running some anti-airport candidates for the Port District that owns that airport, and that airport came within one vote of being closed down.

Moving south from there, recently in the news is the outlying field of Coupeville which is part of the NAS Whidbey Island complex. Coupeville has a residential development called Admiralty Cove just west of there. The outlying field is used for practice carrier landings. The Admiralty Cove residential development is on the slope with view homes looking to the west. It's a tremendously noisy activity that goes on there. Island County has requested that notices to purchasers go out for people buying property around there so they know it's subject to aircraft overflight. The Navy's been practicing there for decades with jet aircraft, and yet there is currently a lawsuit against the Navy for noise being produced by jet operations there. And that's another political as well as legal conflict.

Moving further south, if you look at Paine Field, periodically Paine Field is approached by a commercial air carrier to offer regular commercial air service. In a similar way that, say, San Jose or Oakland is seen as a satellite airport to San Francisco, Paine Field might be seen as some point in the future as providing satellite air carrier service for Sea-Tac. Paine Field is owned by Snohomish County. Snohomish County has to deal with the amount of housing that they've allowed to go in at Mukilteo. It's a similar situation with other airports

in our geography where the airport is on top of a plateau and the field homes are to the west, and every time the air carriers consider coming in there people in Mukilteo put a considerable amount of political pressure on the County to not affect whether the airplanes are allowed to land there – that’s legal according to the FAA – but they still have to get a lease for the terminal facilities from the County. That sets up a real political conflict for the political entity.

And then, of course, at Sea-Tac the third runway has resulted in years and years of litigation, the most recent being a resolution of a suit by 300 property owners against that third runway that was resolved this last December.

One of the things that I did when I was airport manager back in the ‘80s was I had an airport master plan done by Waddell and Associates, and that called for the creation of an airport environs zone and a number of tools, like avigation easements, to be considered by County Planning. And I walked that through County Planning back in the ‘80s and that was sort of the genesis for getting that overlay zone that is now fleshed out, and it’s really a good thing that the County has done that. And it calls for – not to get into too much technicality on this, but it calls for increasing levels of restriction the closer you get to the end of the runways, which is common sense. But anywhere within that overlay zone now avigation easements are required.

And I want to talk just a little bit about avigation easements. They’re a device that – relatively new in planning, really starting to come out in the 1970s. And the idea there is similar to any other kind of easement that you’ve got a certain amount of established use, whether you’re using your neighbor’s driveway or yard as your driveway. If you do it over a certain period of time you get a sort of prescriptive right to do that. The avigation easement is a more formal way of articulating that in a legal sense so that airplanes have a right to fly over somebody’s property – it’s been called colloquially in the business as a “no bitch clause.” It informs people that there is going to be that aircraft overflight, and if the avigation easement is written correctly it allows for expansion of activities and it doesn’t establish just a certain level of activity. One of the contentions – say, at an outlying field, Coupeville, where there’s a new aircraft operating there and people around there are saying, Well, it’s an increased level of noise. I think having avigation easements is a really good thing to have in the planning toolbox, but it should not be seen as mitigating all conflicts at the airport. The example of Anacortes, where there was really no legal challenge to the runway expansion, it was a political challenge to the case in point. I would also say that it should be seen like chemotherapy is in treating cancer. I have no gripes with chemotherapy. It’s a great therapy, but it shouldn’t be used as an excuse to get cancer. And in a way I know that the County has considered the avigation easements and the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan as preventative against airport conflicts. There’s both political limitations in what can be done on that and the original intent – and I know because I was the guy that walked it through the County – was that the avigation easements are best applied in low density

zoning – say, one house per 5 acres. When you get to higher densities they become less effective in preventing conflicts at the airport.

So SASA, the Airport Support Association, has taken an official statement and I'll let David Mischke talk about that. My comments here are my personal observations from professionally working in airport planning, but I can say that airports and housing don't mix. If you have a choice, if you have an alternative, don't put them together. And that any increase in housing over what you've currently got – which is not much housing near there – is going to simply cause more airport conflicts. We can get into the weeds on this. We can talk about legal details on aviation easements. We can talk about different densities. We can talk about the advantages of having multi-units over four units per acre. We could also talk about having double-wide trailers and **deck cars** out there as a preferable use to having any kind of houses out there. But don't forget the overall point: Look at the history of airports in Puget Sound and elsewhere in the country and realize that any increase in residences around the airport are going to increase the conflicts of that airport and eventually lead to restrictions on operations and potential expansion of that airport. And to that I would like to just quote an economic figure for the value of the airport calculated by the State Department of Transportation, and the economic impact of Skagit Regional Airport annually is \$57-million for the local region.

David, would you like to comment on SASA's position?

Mr. Mischke: Well, I'll just mention that at a board meeting we tried to succinctly say our position, and it says: "Whereas SASA recognizes that placing residences next to the airport creates conflicts, it therefore takes the position that the residential density should not be increased, that industrial land uses are preferred next to the airport."

Mr. Timmerman: Thank you very much. I really appreciate this for everyone. Skagit Regional Airport isn't just a local transportation asset. It's a state transportation asset and it's part of what we call the **NIBIA** system: It's a national transportation asset, so it is filed to the national aviation system, not just to the state. And I really appreciate a local perspective.

Is there anything you'd like to share as a pilot about traffic pattern or operations or aircraft that fly out of there that the County should consider when making a decision?

Mr. Mischke: You know, I don't think of anything offhand that is in addition to what we already know about it. We have the environment overlay, which does cover the normal traffic patterns. I guess the biggest thing to note is that if and when a problem develops with somebody flying in and out, the choices of a place to put the plane down – it would be good if they're not limited to very specific

runway positions. So we know every once in a while people will have problems and it's nice to have a place to put down.

Mr. Timmerman: What's the – the current residential single-family allows for – was it 10, 15% open space per unit? Is that correct? Does that sound about right? Or was it 5%? So do you think increasing the open space requirement would be helpful for this? Yes?

Mr. Mischke: I guess so.

Mr. Rosenhan: May I make one other comment? The conflicts I was talking about had mostly to do with people getting disturbed by the noise of the aircraft. There is another consideration that isn't often talked about and that's just the safety around airports. And I'm thankful that when I was Airport Manager up there we had no fatal crashes, but since 2006 there have been four fatal crashes at and around Skagit Regional Airport. Only one of those was really near the runway on takeoff. A guy hooked up his control cables wrong and stalled out the aircraft. The other three were all on instrument approaches into the airport or on missed approaches on the instrument approaches to the airport. One of those was in the infield between the two runways. The aircraft impacted. The other was over by Bayview State Park and the third was up by Chuckanut Drive. And, actually, if you map those out they bracket the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan.

Now these can fall outside of the statistical realm where both the FAA and the state would map out the accident potential zones and have these other imaginary surfaces there. But it should still be kept in mind that building around the airport is not without risk. Airplanes do sometimes fall out of the sky. And there's going to be some political perception of that if anybody was actually to look at that map because it's – the airport does have some activities. And it's not to be scared of those activities. It's – by all other transportation standards it's a very safe way to travel. But it should be kept in mind when you have a choice of siting high density residential around the airport or not that the safety of that airport and of those residences should be considered.

Mr. Timmerman: Thank you. Thank you very much. Les, do you want to introduce yourself?

Mr. Smith: Again, my name's Les Smith. I'm with Washington Pilot's Association. I'm the state President, as such representing roughly a thousand members statewide. We are a non-profit organization whose mission is advocacy, outreach, education and social activities. And it's in advocacy and education that I hope to be here today.

I want to compliment you on the jewel that you have at Skagit Airport. Bayview is well-known across the state and beyond. It's a great hopping off point if one of our members is coming from the eastern side of the state and wants to stop

somewhere before they launch out into the islands. It's also the kind of place that a pilot heading back to the east side of the state or south down the west side might consider an entry point to coming back from the islands. In other words, it's a – refueling happens there. But it's also a place to stop and check the weather and then move on. There's also a nice restaurant there and pilots know where restaurants are on airports, so we fly for food!

But it *is* a concern and it's a great deal of concern that we hear about this kind of activity coming closer to the airport because, as pilots, we read a lot of literature, we're aware of a lot of situations, and we see the sort of things that Tom (sic) was talking about as happening across the country. We hear about them. And this bears all the markers of the same sort of thing happening again. So that's our concern. Now I personally live on the downwind side of Paine Field. That means that airplanes fly over me at a thousand feet above the ground. They're in a pattern to take them in and land at Paine Field. When the real estate agent saw me – as my wife and I were shopping – saw me looking up at the airplane she was urgent to tell me that they don't make much noise, and to which my wife replied, You don't understand. To him that's music. But to my neighbor next door it is noise. And worse than that, he's actually quite frightened by the idea of airplanes falling out of the sky. That's a very real fear for him. When he looks up, he's looking up as if he was an air traffic controller and trying to make sure there aren't two airplanes trying to occupy the same sites. Unfortunately that does happen now and then, but the kinds of fatalities that you mentioned aren't quite of that category.

But patterns and where they occur – the downwind, the base, the final – and being the first time here with you I apologize. I don't know if you know what “downwind,” “base,” and “final” mean.

Mr. Walters: Assume we don't.

Mr. Smith: Let's assume you don't? Let's say this table is the runway. If I'm going to land this way and I'm going to have a left-hand pattern typically, and in the case of 1129 I'd be coming on a 45 from this direction. So earlier – actually, the drawing that I'd like was the one that you had before which shows the districts. There. I'd be coming from the upper right-hand corner and I'd be descending to 1000 – roughly 1000 feet, because the airport elevation is 126.

Unidentified male voice: 150.

Mr. Smith: 150 – okay. So I'd be at 1100. But I'd be 1000 feet off the ground so I'd be descending to 1000 feet. At 1000 feet, as I'm descending I'm going to be backed off on the throttle. When I reach 1000, I'm going to apply throttle, so I'm going to be applying some throttle right over the upper corner of your – the blue – the upper left corner of the blue, BR-Residential. As I approach the runway as I come in closer, I'll turn to parallel. That's called – I'm on a 45 downwind then I

turn on a left downwind. I'm going to turn out beyond. I'm going to turn a "base" leg and descend, and then descend finally as I approach the runway to come in and land. That's the pattern. Left 45; downwind; at the end of the runway I begin to make my descent below that 1000 feet and come around and come in and land. Those are patterns that pilots announced on the published frequency, and we listen to those and we keep track of each other and we develop a mental picture of what's going on at that airport. Because we've got another runway and we've got another pattern and there can be people using that runway at the same time. We develop that mental picture and we maintain it.

So I'll point out that just at the place that I'm going to make a little more noise by applying throttle again is at that upper left corner of BR-R, and I'm just talking about the larger of the two runways. Of course, that larger than two might mean that the larger of the aircraft that want to get in.

I also want to echo the concerns that Carter mentioned about solar panels. Recently in the news in London was a skyscraper that they referred to as the "cell phone" because it actually has a parabolic shape to it. And someone recently parked their car down below and it gathered enough solar energy to melt components of that car. The sun, when I'm flying the earliest remarks that I have of what is see in the distance are sun reflections off of windshields, other types of things that can be from a great distance. If it's more immediately below me as I'm in the pattern, I'd have some concern about the strength of that kind of thing. So that's the reason I'm concerned about the reflectivity of solar panels.

I'm curious about multi-family and the attribution of the percentage or the density of multi-family to BR-CC versus BR-R. And the reason for that is – it goes back to where I live. I live on that area outside of Paine Field that was mentioned. I'm not in one of the bigger McMansions. I'm one of the smaller ones. I'm down the hill and I don't have a nice view. \_\_\_\_\_. But, nevertheless, people who live in higher density have less of a tendency to make complaints about noise than people who live in individual homes. I know this because as a former board member of a homeowner association with densities of both types, where did the complaints come from that approached the board and said, You've got to do something about – put a position on the table with Paine Field. And that was the source, or that was the greater source. I'll echo those as well and my perspective on the line. It would be a shame to see the jewel that you have impinged upon by the kinds of things that seem almost formulaic in the way that they're occurring. And I would urge you to give a strong consideration to that. Skagit's value, the recent Flight Fest and the success of that was phenomenal. Mr. Anders representing the museum and their coming in – all of those attest to the jewel that you have. Thank you.

Several people: Thank you.

Commissioner Dillon: May I ask a question? So do all sizes of planes do that same approach that you're talking about, from the single-engine whatever they are – I know nothing about airplanes, but –

Mr. Smith: To a degree, yes.

Commissioner Dillon: Okay.

Mr. Smith: Airplanes that are on instrument approaches are doing a different thing than those that are on what are called "visual flight rules." Those of us – I don't have the numbers for what percentage of operations are instrument approaches into the field versus visual, but I suspect VFR is quite a larger share.

Ms. Young: It's still the vast majority.

Mr. Smith: Vast majority. So most are going to be using that kind of a pattern in a VFR setting.

Commissioner Dillon: Thank you.

Unidentified male voice: Corporate jets often do straight-in/straight-out approaches. The corporate jets which are coming considerably faster, they will oftentimes do straight-ins.

Commissioner Dillon: Okay.

Mr. Pernula: I also have a question. There seems to be a conflict between how you deal with the nuisance noise issue and how you deal with the potential safety issue. Because, for example, in the Guidelines it recommends within Zone 6 that if you have residential \_\_ you have at least fifteen dwelling units per acre, which means it's going to be attached housing. It's going to be fairly high density. However, that would seem to conflict with the notion that as you get closer to the airport it might be less and less safe. Do you have any comments about that? Your comments seem to be recommending higher densities where fewer people would have a problem with the noise than lower densities where they would.

Unidentified male voice: I'd be curious about what multi-family does in terms of the open space. How does that work out?

Mr. Timmerman: What we recommend is we do recommend multi-family because it has different societal expectations attached to it. And the structure of multi-family development reduces the impact to the residents because it's a multi-walled structure, and people typically that use multi-family are there for a transitory time. So they have different expectations of enjoying a quiet, serene environment when you have different structural components. And with multi-family, we recommend additional open space because you're putting more

dwelling units in one space allowing for open space. Does that kind of make sense then?

Mr. Rosenhan: Carter, could I \_\_\_\_ or ask a question?

Mr. Timmerman: Sure, Tim.

Mr. Rosenhan: You're recommending multi-family in lieu of what densities?

Mr. Timmerman: Well, we would recommend multi-family over single-family. It's a preferable alternative outside the approach, because we're not going to recommend putting a high density or high intensity use in the approach to the airport where your majority of your aircraft accidents are going to occur statistically.

Mr. Rosenhan: \_\_\_\_

Mr. Timmerman: Sure.

Mr. Rosenhan: \_\_\_\_ again. I mean, I think we need to get this density question. Before the Subarea Plan was adopted, the background zoning was one house per 5 acres. Would you recommend multi-family over one house per 5-acre, or would you recommend multi-family over four houses per acre? At what point do you want to encourage more people to be around the airport?

Mr. Timmerman: Well, it's a little bit more complicated than that. First you have to look at whether it's a rural environment. If it's a rural environment, which doesn't have that intensity of use or the density, you have 1 acre – one house per 5 acres. But if it's in an urban environment, which is what we're talking about – this is an urban level of intensity – I would prefer to see multi-family.

Unidentified male voice: So do you call this urban or do you call it rural?

Mr. Timmerman: Excuse me, sir?

Same unidentified male voice: Is the Bayview, as it is today, is it urban or is it rural?

Mr. Timmerman: It's going to be urban.

Mr. Walters: Let's back up to the –

Mr. Rosahan: What is it today?



Mr. Timmerman: Today? Well, its existing use – as my understanding from my tour of the area – is ag. Low density residential, I believe is one dwelling unit per 4 acres.

Mr. Rosenhan: Correct.

Mr. Walters: Let's back up. Let's back up a little bit. So multi-family is a housing type, and I don't think it necessarily informs the discussion about density. So density is a separate issue from the housing type. In the existing Subarea Plan and in the proposed revision it would be four to six units per acre overall, but you might end up with sixteen units per acre over here of condominiums but, heck, you could also do sixteen units per acre of single-family housing. It's physically possible to construct sixteen single-family dwellings on an acre. Maybe that would never happen but, you know, that just illustrates the fact that housing type is different from the density issue.

We also have a map here of the existing development in the area, and if you look on this map – I can use the laser pointer – this purple area here is existing residential development and this sort of orangish area is the golf course at the Country Club. So if you take out the golf course you have relatively high density in the Country Club area, and especially over here in this Bay Hill development where there is no golf course you have some pretty good density. I think Kirk has the numbers, but I think it gets close to four units per acre over here. That's all existing.

Unidentified male voice: How does that fit in with your noise abatement procedure?

Ms. Young: The Country Club?

Same unidentified male voice: Yeah, the existing residential development there. Because your airport does have the noise abatement procedure, doesn't it?

Ms. Young: We do. We have a – it's our Fly Neighborhood program. It specifically asks pilots to try to stay above 1000 feet when they're over the Country Club. That's what it's there for – the fact that we already have some height restrictions \_\_\_\_\_.

Same unidentified male voice: At 1000 feet over the Country Club you could – most airports could glide to the landing strip without having to stall and land vertically.

Mr. Timmerman: That's how John Townsley just put his aircraft down.

(laughter)

Unidentified male voice: As I fly across countryside it's my habit to constantly look for, Where would I land if my engine quit right now, and golf courses are prime for that.

(laughter)

Same unidentified male voice: Golf courses are prime. The site's prime.

Commissioner Dahlstedt: You know, one of the things that's also unique about this particular airport is on all four sides of the airport there's ag land. And if you're a pilot, unless you're going straight down, there's lots of areas completely encircling that entire hill for people to land. I had one land near my parents' house about 300 yards away here within the last few years, and they're on – they would be on the west side of the airport. So there's a lot of area there. It sounds like what I'm hearing quite a bit is more about the danger to the airport is really more complaints or the people rising up not wanting the airport to be maximizing its potential utilization – the airport more so than safety.

Mr. Timmerman: You do have airport overlay in a place that limits density in the most critical areas. I think that the County's done a great job of addressing that aspect. But you – when we look at airports, what we see is encroachment of incompatible land uses. It limits their functionality. It can lead to demands on changing of the operations; it can lead to limitations on the expansion of the airport; it can – there was a case down in California where they wanted to shorten a runway just to limit the type of aircraft that could land there.

Commissioner Dahlstedt: I guess my question would be here in Skagit County agriculture's one of our most critical industries and we have a right to farm. If you have a house or you buy a house in the area you sign an agreement that dust, noise, a lot of things – doesn't matter if you like it or not, when you buy there you sign an agreement, and why couldn't we do the same thing here? Because if it's not safety, if it's not their life and well-being, why couldn't we just have something like that?

Mr. Timmerman: Well, I think that Les brought up a good point that just because you sign a paper doesn't stop you from flying \_\_\_\_\_. \_\_\_\_\_ Port of Anacortes where they almost shut the airport down by \_\_\_\_\_. Is that correct?

Mr. Rosenhan: That was the Port Commission. This is also an airport owned by a three-person Port Commission and so it's more susceptible to that sort of change than \_\_\_\_\_. But, I mean, those are – the conflict areas are conflicts with the noise created by airport operations with people who don't like that noise nearby. That creates both a legal and a political tension. And there are safety considerations. The safety considerations are statistically considered in some of the airport overlay zones that increasingly restrict the

kinds of density development we have the closer you get to the ends of the runway. You often end up with trapezoidal shaped areas off the end of the airport that the FAA calls “safety areas.” If you’re doing a military plan, it would be called an “accident potential zone.”

But I’d like to distinguish between the specifics on those zones, which are set up based on overall statistics and the practical reality. If you have a choice as a land use planning organization to put residences around an airport or not, you have to consider the overall safety and involvement. You can’t ignore the fact that there’ve been four fatal crashes on there since 2006. And does that fit into some sort of actuarial table where you know that you’re going to find a certain percentage – like a hundred-year flood – of a crash now came within a particular radius of an airport? No. All I’m saying is that as a practical matter you have to take a look at what choices you have as land use decision makers. Do you allow houses to go in there? If you have an alternative, why not put them in another location?

There’s also been a bit of change of use in the airport over the years, certainly since I was Airport Manager there. It was primarily single-engine aircraft, all of them propeller-driven that were based out of there, and you didn’t get jet fuel at that facility until 2003 – something like that. So there’s an increasing amount of turbine-powered aircraft that are coming in there which are higher performance aircraft. They can be quieter, but the – it’s important to note that the airport doesn’t – the airport owner doesn’t have control over the noise created by individual pilots. They have a suggested noise abatement procedure that’s a good neighbor policy to fly quiet, but any kind of aircraft can operate out of this airport if they choose to do that. You could have – with existing runway length – you could have 737 business jets operating out of there – technically. You’d need a market to be able to do that. But you can’t look to the Port at some point in the future to come in and put restrictions on who can fly in there and who can’t. They don’t have that sort of control. Is that correct?

Ms. Young: Right. We would never do that.

Mr. Timmerman: Thank you. Comments?

(silence)

Mr. Timmerman: Now I’d like to take the opportunity, since we heard from the state, we heard from local, we heard from WSDOT. John Collins is on the phone. John? Could you weigh in from a national perspective since you’re coming from Washington, D.C. today?

John Collins: (unintelligible)

Mr. Timmerman: Okay, Maryland today. Okay.

Mr. Collins: It's a little difficult to hear some of the comments that are being made, but I think a lot of what I've heard is focusing on the densities around the airport. Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. Timmerman: That's correct.

Mr. Collins: Okay. Now I know that those comments made about higher density areas and having some of the housing there the expectations are a little bit different. That's just the way the \_\_\_\_\_ and that sort of thing. And while that's true there's also the \_\_\_ economy and now the safety aspect of it and the off-airport maintenance. We see, you know – unfortunately airplanes and houses don't do very well and that's not a good thing.

From a national perspective, I mean I think the state is doing a really good job in planning \_\_\_\_\_ sponsors to think about what goes in around the airports. I think this plan for the most part is, you know, really, really showing that and, you know, I would agree with the majority of the comments that are being made today about \_\_\_ prevent. One of the things we've seen over the years is that as an airport gets encroached, generally if it gets residentially encroached there's more and more of a call to do something about the airport to the airport sponsor or to the community that the airport happens to be in, whether the community is the owner of the airport or not. And that has a tendency to restrict the operations of the airport over time. And so our counsel is to generally try to keep the residential encroachments away from the airport as best as possible and, you know, surround it with a more compatible land use. You know, right now we have a lot of light industry and heavy industry off to one area in this plan, and you're pushing back a little bit. Now as I'm sitting here and listening to this I'm looking at Google Earth, I'm looking at a map that – the imagery is a few years old but it looks like it's changed substantially. And it looks like you're trying to prevent that encroachment and that looks really good, although \_\_\_\_\_ to say you're going to double or more than double the residents over the next – what is it? – fifteen years, twenty years, something like that – or less. So, you know, I think any intention that can be made to keep the higher density away from the airport and put more compatible land uses closer to the airport that's a good thing to do, and that has a tendency to keep airports open longer and prevent them from being a flashpoint in the community.

Commissioner Dahlstedt: I just have one question for you, maybe from this aspect across the country.

Mr. Collins: Sure.

Commissioner Dahlstedt: I'm Commissioner Dahlstedt. Has there ever been a school hit by a plane that you're aware of?

Mr. Collins: Off the top of my head I'd have to say no.

Commissioner Dahlstedt: Because that's been one of the things that's been a concern in our area is the potential in Environs Zone 6 that a school wouldn't be located there because it wouldn't be safe. And I guess that's a huge concern, I know, for our school board in that area, so that's why I asked the question.

Mr. Collins: Well, when we discussed this with other communities previously we certainly had recommended not locating schools near airports. In fact, we were very active down in California trying to keep them – we had legislation – to keep them at least two miles away from an airport. If you look at some of the accidents that the Washington State \_\_\_\_\_ they used the studies that California did doing scatter boxes of the accidents around the airport, I don't know that any of those were ever associated with any school or not. But if you take a look at where those accidents occurred of course more of them occurred closer to the airport \_\_\_\_\_ away from the airport you're probably less likely to have that – have somebody actually crash out there. And if you put a school outside of that area then you can take a look at it and there's probably maybe a majority of that potential.

Commissioner Dahlstedt: Thanks.

Mr. Walters: There's one other thing I wanted to add in. I live in Anacortes and there's been several mentions of the Anacortes Airport. And just for a bit of perspective, there are houses like 50 feet off the runway in Anacortes. There is no one better at airport planning than Anacortes!

(laughter)

Mr. Walters: It's pretty impressive. Here we are talking about a really large area that exists inside Airport Zone 6. It stretches almost all the way to Riverbend and way, way past Bay View there. So I think we all appreciate all the concerns but if we're talking Airport Zone 6, Airport Zone 6 is a really large area so maybe as we go forward you could specify – maybe as you, sir, did exactly: The runway area is a problematic area versus the entirety of Zone 6. Because we have a lot of existing housing in Zone 6 and probably will in the future.

Mr. Timmerman: How would that be consistent with Growth Management?

Mr. Walters: Well, it's just a really large area, is my point. The entirety of Airport Zone 6 is not planned for urban levels of development. I'm not suggesting that. I'm just saying that there's a lot of –

Mr. Timmerman: The law says you're required to discourage encroachment of land uses close to the airports and within the airport operational area.

Mr. Walters: Well, what I'm saying is the Airport Zone 6 is a really large area.

Mr. Timmerman: That's the airport operating area.

Mr. Walters: There're a lot of people that have individual parcels that will build houses on.

Mr. Timmerman: Oh, yeah.

Mr. Walters: Right.

Mr. Timmerman: I mean, that's the existing right, correct?

Mr. Walters: Right, right, right.

Mr. Timmerman: Oh, yeah – absolutely.

Mr. Walters: Yeah, yeah, yeah. That's just my \_\_\_\_.

Same unidentified male voice: \_\_\_\_ take that away. \_\_\_\_\_. All right – just for clarification.

Different unidentified male voice: By the way, when one is teaching about encroachment and land use issues an aerial photograph of Anacortes is usually – is a favorite of not good planning practice.

Mr. Timmerman: And you know what's funny about Anacortes is a lot of the people that complain aren't the ones right directly adjacent to the airport. They're the people farther out in the traffic pattern. In fact, I've run across the same thing at commercial service airports where you get more complaints from what we call simple noise events and pushback.

Unidentified male voice: The challenge is that we approach this from within an environment that's structured around the law, and yet when you find – if this formula that I referred to plays out as it has elsewhere you are less likely to find your challenge over in the courthouse and more likely to find it right here in this room. That's where it's going to play out.

Mr. Holloran: If I can interrupt – I apologize. The Commissioners have another conflict and they have to leave, and it was exceptional that they made the meeting so they could hear the breadth of what you had to say.

Commissioner Dillon: And we apologize for having to leave. Unfortunately it just worked out that way. And normally our meeting is in Mount Vernon and it happens to be in Lyman today. So we apologize for having to leave but – and we'll touch bases with our note-takers when we get back.

Mr. Pernula: And it is being recorded, as well.

Commissioner Dillon: Okay, thank you. Thank you all for coming. We appreciate it very much.

Mr. Timmerman: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Dillon: Thanks, guys.

Mr. Holloran: So, again, I didn't mean to interrupt, so pick it up where you were. I apologize for that.

I guess, as a County Administrator, I have a couple of things that are troubling. We've been going down this path for a long period of time. We started a 2060 twenty-year plan, fifty-year plan, hundred-year plan, what's happening in the county and – the Commissioners are faced with a real dilemma with where growth goes. And there's been some curve balls. Tim, you talk about the avigation easements and the deal that was cut with the landowners – that the Port would not oppose a residential plan. It was explained by one of your Port Commissioners who said that officially they couldn't come out and oppose – it's legalese, so to speak, but it seems in hindsight disingenuous. These landowners said, We have a plan. We're going to build residential. The County said, We need to put residential outside of the floodway, off of ag land, and here's a place to receive it. I respect everything that's being said here, but it kind of threw a big curve ball in the whole plan. Right, wrong, or indifferent. The Commissioners are going to have to decide on Bay View and what happens up there – where the density goes.

The reason there was an additional 110 acres of industrial is because of the Envisioning process that said it makes sense to put more industrial up by the airport. The Commissioners made that move and said, Let's find more industrial. Let's move the residential away from the airport. The shocker is Zone 6 is huge and all along we felt like if we're going to create some density we have to find a place for a school. The update in the guidebook, there's a clarification that says in a footnote that a high school or lower shouldn't be placed up there. Again, it might be the right thing to say but it's a curve ball and we have to make some changes. We have a School Board here that we had assured people that the landowners are going to make sure there's a site for a school, and the School Board would have to go to the public and say, Let's vote on putting a school. There's no way we can put a school up there now. And again, we want to do the right thing. All I want is to go on record is that there're some real curve balls here for the County Commissioners in determining how this plan is adjusted. We've been working with landowners and working with committees, working with the Port, but we have to make some adjustments.

Mr. Rosenhan: I hear that Ron hits the curve pretty well, though.

Mr. Holloran: What's that?

Mr. Rosenhan: I hear that Ron hits the curve pretty well. I appreciate what you're saying on that, Tim. I'd like to clarify just a couple of things from what I understand about the record on how this came about. First of all, the RCW that was first put up there was passed in 1996 so it actually predated the Comprehensive Plan, and so this is – to my understanding – the only formal consultation that happened with the airport users. So if there were decisions that were made, the formal aviation community didn't have input in it early, so I recognize that that may cause some issues now.

There are other factors that may certainly impinge on the Commissioners' decision to pass this PUD ordinance. Beyond its impact on the airport there's – as I understand – an economic study on whether this whole development pencils out being done by ECONorthwest, the products of which will be out in a couple weeks or so. I've got a question. In the event that the Commissioners look at that – and this is hypothetical – and they decide that the economics aren't sustainable, that they can't support the PUD ordinance based on what the results of that study say, and they don't pass the PUD ordinance – maybe this is a question for you, Dale – what then, with what can be done on that land, what's the – what is the status of that land? What sort of densities of housing would be allowed if that PUD ordinance doesn't pass?

Mr. Pernula: Well, it would still be under the moratorium until we pass that ordinance, so we'd still prohibit any development with more than four lots.

Mr. Walters: But the same densities would still be allowed.

Mr. Rosenhan: So how many people then would be allowed within that subarea?

Mr. Pernula: We would have to look at how much land, how many existing parcels of land there are that can be subdivided and calculate it. It would be a very limited number.

Mr. Rosenhan: So is it – it shouldn't be surprising then that people who are on the Airport's Port Association and connected with aviation would oppose the PUD because that would revert back to a much lower density and much less likely conflict with aviation and the airport.

Mr. Pernula: Maybe, but there's a bit of a problem because we already have an adopted Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan which suggests much higher densities, and we have this moratorium which should be somewhat temporary until something else occurs. So we'll have to take some sort of action to reconcile the two.



Mr. Walters: I also think it's not true that the County didn't consult with aviation when it did its initial subarea plan, because we did have that seventy-page study that Reid Middleton created that is on the website that uses the WSDOT guidelines – the then-current WSDOT guidelines. And they also recommended no school at Bay View Ridge, but the Planning Commission, I think, followed that recommendation and the County Commissioners allowed a school up there because it's so integrated into the community and because there already is one up there inside Airport Zone 6.

Mr. Timmerman: Just for clarification, WSDOT does not – if it's an existing use within there, that's fine. Those planners and the community members were never handed a clean slate, right? They have to accept what's already there. So just to keep the meeting rolling here, can we go – yes, sir?

Mr. Gentry: I do have a comment, actually, I'd like – I'm Kendall Gentry. I'm a member of – secretary – of the SASA Board. I also build – a home builder. I think the County – my personal opinion, not official position – is that the revised plan that you come up with by reducing some of the residential and adding more industrial is a good compromise plan and I think it should go forward, personally. And I think that that's obviously divergent opinion from the other aviation speakers today, but I just think that that's – there has to be a compromise on how this comes together.

Mr. Timmerman: All opinions are \_\_\_\_\_. I appreciate your input. So just to keep the meeting rolling...

Mr. Anders: Alan Anders, the Heritage Flight Museum. I'm just coming up to speed on this issue and I don't know a lot of the details, so I'll make just some general comments.

Our museum is a flying museum out of Bellingham. It suffered some of the things that Tim was talking about up there. One of the things that attracts us to Skagit is the low density around the airport. We operate twelve vintage aircraft. We fly them. It looks like a great flying environment up there, and that's one of the things that attracts us to possibly moving our museum \_\_\_\_\_ and the economic benefits that come with it to Skagit. One of the philosophies I've always had as a pilot is always stack the deck for safety in your favor. And I just see high density around airports as not stacking the deck. It's a risk kind of an issue. My objectivity has been slightly affected by being an eye witness to a \_\_\_ jet going into a residential neighborhood in Hillsboro, Oregon, that's got a lot of density around it. Amazingly, nobody but the pilot was killed. I tell you, when you see that happen you think twice.

So putting residential or any high density near an airport is just – in my opinion – not a good risk management action. So I say that if there's any other alternatives to build or develop elsewhere, look at those \_\_\_\_\_ the airport.

Mr. Timmerman: Thank you very much. Sara, is there anything you'd like to add?

Ms. Young: I would like to add some things, Carter. Thank you. I guess I'd like to talk a little bit about the history of the Port and the County and the work on the Airport Environs Overlay and the development of the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan. We've been a partner with the County throughout and we've been involved in the development of the PUD ordinance, so we're very familiar with what's gone on here.

What I will say is that I believe, from everything I've seen on other airports, that we have outstanding airport protection regulations at Skagit Regional Airport. Skagit County was a fantastic partner right around 2000, coming out of the 1999 WSDOT Land Use Protection Guidelines, in working with us on that. And we had a land use compatibility study done, we had a former colleague of Carter's with WSDOT who led a lot of that effort for us. He was very involved. And in that regulation there are a number of protections for the airport, not only the establishment of the safety overlay, aviation easements, notice to purchasers, open space requirements, and limitations on the specific uses. So I think, in general, I feel like we've done well. But anybody who's ever managed an airport knows that airport protection is never done and it's constant. It's not as simple as this land use or that land use and this regulation or that regulation. It's a myriad of things that come up all the time. You know, Carter and I had a conversation after our meeting a couple of weeks ago. Some of the most significant threats to our airports come from utility companies, and they are often exempt from all the regulation and so it's really difficult to even find the regulatory mechanism to get involved in a project like that and have any impact on it. Thermal plumes – that's a hazard I haven't heard here today. Those are a significant issue at our airport right now. PSE has a generating facility southwest corner of the airport right off the departure service runway 22, and that's an issue and an ongoing conflict.

So, you know, we're always paying attention to these things and we're always working on what can we do, from trying to be involved in things at the policy level and establishment of regulations to just getting involved and commenting on a project level when we get a SEPA review coming through. We've had penetrations threatening the airport – just myriad issues that come up, and so airport protection, the job's never done. We need to keep moving forward.

Since we did that initial work with Skagit County, time has marched on. A lot of time has marched on. And a couple of things have happened. WSDOT has come out with a new guidebook – the 2011 Land Use Protection Guidebook. The Port – our airport – has also seen some pretty significant changes. We

passed a master plan. In 2007 the master plan was adopted by the Commission. It establishes a vision for the airport that is basically increased commercial activity, not commercial in the scheduled airliner service but in the general aviation support role aeronautical services. Freight and just a general more business use – that’s kind of our big vision for this airport. When we look at the regional transportation scene with Bellingham going commercial, Paine Field now having the option to go commercial, we understand that this airport is absolutely critical to the transportation system in this state. And I love your word “jewel”! Skagit *is* a jewel. It’s an amazing facility. It’s a lot of facility for a quiet little county like Skagit County. We now have jet fuel, we have a first class jet center, and we have enough runway to get just about any size business jet in and out of our airport efficiently, and we see increasing operations numbers. We’re counting our numbers this year with a new survey and we’re at close to 550 jet operations as of July.

So Skagit is growing and our vision is much more honed and I think just stronger than it was ten, fifteen years ago when all this started. And so, in a way, I like to say that it’s almost like a new planning process is coming right on the heels of this regulation, and we really have to look at that. We have new data available. So the Port, I think – you know, we have been very supportive of what’s happened on Bay View Ridge with the urban growth area, and I don’t think that’s changed. There’s a relationship between the protection of the airport and the land use laws that Skagit County is beholden to with Growth Management, and there is a path forward. So I guess I would just say that we’re in the ring very much for airport protection purposes. I feel good about where we’re going. I feel great about the introduction of more industrial land near the airport. I think some of our bigger concerns are not actually part of the subarea at all. They are the pastoral lands outside the subarea that haven’t been given a lot of focus. So we have more work to do continually. And I guess I would just say that we really welcome WSDOT’s involvement and we really like to look at what we have in that Airport Environs Overlay and how it relates to the 2001 guidebook and where we should be looking at making some tweaks. My understanding is the school issue has been very clearly not a recommended use in the 2001 guidebook. Residential’s a little squishier than that – it’s limited residential. So I think there is room in what we’re – in the path that we’re on here to be compatible with that guidebook, but I think we’d be looking for good input from you guys.

Mr. Timmerman: I appreciate – that was eloquent and well-put. I’d like to just touch on a couple other things that you had mentioned regarding how Skagit County fits the \_\_\_ system, because, as Sara mentioned, Bellingham has went (sic) commercial and what you’ll see is a migration of GA activity down to Skagit. The reason: Commercial and GA often don’t mix. GA pilots have – you’ve seen this train wreck over and over and over again. You know, for Paine Field it brings in more commercial \_\_\_\_\_ different activities and then the GA’ll go over to, like, Harvey Field or SIA. GA goes over to Felts. With Bellingham you’re going to see – I mean, they’ve had an incredible – it just – an incredible increase in

operations. It's astronomical. They have wetland restraints so they can't – they have a capacity problem up there for storage of aircraft so it's all going to migrate down here. Blaine closed, so with the closure of Blaine there's a whole other – airports, aircraft moving and migrating. So there's a lot of things that we have to consider. Skagit is – in the Washington aviation system it's considered a regional service airport. That's the second highest level you can be. The only thing higher is a commercial service airport. With what – Sara had mentioned a path forward. What I would like to do now is that we've talked about kind of some of the issues, some of our concerns. What are some of the recommendations that the pilots have? I mean, is there some alternatives that you – I mean I'm asking a lot right now right off the bat, but if there's some alternatives to the plan and changes in the plan that you think would make it more compatible and less impactful to the airport I would love to hear them. Anyone at this time have any recommendations for Dale and his staff? Yes?

Unidentified male voice: Actually you've already taken, it appears – I should say the Commissioners – the step of providing for more industrial – light industrial – and that seems to be for the SASA discussions the obvious choice of providing light industrial lands as opposed to residential lands so that the residents would be moved as far from the airport as is reachable.

Mr. Timmerman: A recommendation: Increase industrial lands. How about open space requirement? We had mentioned that earlier. I know that in – correct me if I'm wrong, Dale; I get it a lot – but there is a mechanism within the development regulations that allows transfer of development rights to rural lands, correct? For density increases?

Mr. Pernula: We don't have a TDR program.

Mr. Timmerman: Oh.

Mr. Pernula: However, I believe through the PUD process within one's individual property –

Mr. Timmerman: Okay.

Mr. Pernula: – you could transfer, you know, the gross density to have a higher net density somewhere else.

Mr. Timmerman: That would thus leave more open space, correct?

Mr. Pernula: It would.

Mr. Timmerman: All right. Any other recommendations? Yes, Tim?

Mr. Rosenhan: Should there in the event that this thing gets kicked down the road or a decision against the PUD on economic grounds, and we don't know what that's going to be, I just – and Dale suggests that it's – in a way it's kind of uncharted territory out there as to how to proceed in that event that there be regular meetings by the aviation group with the Planning Department and the County, should there be a change in course here.

Mr. Timmerman: Oh, but actually that is actually a recommendation in our formal consultation process is that we continue this dialogue in the future and the local jurisdiction. You have all that \_\_\_\_, Dale?

Mr. Pernula: Yes.

Mr. Timmerman: Would it be possible to update the participants as things progress?

Mr. Pernula: Sure. We have a whole list of people.

Mr. Timmerman: Great. That'll be fantastic. I really appreciate you putting this together, and the materials. It made it a lot simpler than reading the entire scenario. Okay, any other comments, or adjourn? Okay. Thank you very much – oh, yes, sir?

Mr. Holloran: The last thing I'd like to say, again getting back to the school siting. It seems to me there's a current flaw in the plan. It seems to the Commissioners that we can't site a school in the Airport Environs. So that needs to be addressed and will be addressed. We've met with the School District. If we are going to create density it will trigger the need for a new school. The Board of Commissioners are still committed to make sure the school needs are met because of the density we're creating. But the School District has asked that the Bayview Plan not be approved until there is a school site established based on the density trigger. And that's been communicated to the Board of Commissioners individually. So again, we talk about an existing school up there but it's felt by both the Board of County Commissioners and the School District that there's no option to site a school up there. I just want to go on the record. That is a major, major concern of the residents in Bayview now. We had – the last meeting we had there was 150 people that showed up. And on record we just said, Don't worry. We're going to make sure there's a school site. We need to communicate a new message to those people and figure out the path forward on the school. So again, I want the Aviation Division to know that because of this clarification we need to readdress that situation.

Mr. Timmerman: Yes?

Mr. Bouslog: Can I say something?

Mr. Timmerman: I think that everyone's had an opportunity to speak. Would anyone have an objection? This is –

Mr. Bouslog: John Bouslog.

Mr. Timmerman: – John Bouslog. He's a landowner. I think that everyone has put their input and I have no problem with John \_\_\_.

Mr. Bouslog: I would like to just point out that when the County formed the Citizen Advisory Committee – it worked on this plan back in 2000 – SASA was represented on that committee by Julie Hubner, and that committee took meetings over about a two-year time period. And when Julie came on the board she was not crazy about the plan. By the time we had, you know, addressed her concerns she seemed to be in favor of it, and that was before the 110 acres of industrial property is to be added. So SASA had quite good representation on that committee at that time.

Mr. Timmerman: Thank you very much.

Mr. Bouslog: I could say a lot of other stuff but...

(laughter)

Mr. Timmerman: Okay. Well, thank you all for your time. I greatly appreciate taking out of your busy schedule. And, Alan, one last thing.

Mr. Anders: Yes?

Mr. Timmerman: Would it be possible for you to bring up that P-38 out of Tillamook for the Air Museum for me?

Mr. Anders: You talk them into it and I'll bring it up.

Mr. Timmerman: They're going to close it! They're going to close the Tillamook Air Museum.

Mr. Pernula: Okay, then the meeting's concluded. So, John?

Mr. Collins: All right. Well, I appreciate the opportunity to call in.  
\_\_\_\_\_.

Mr. Pernula: Thanks for \_\_\_\_\_.

Mr. Collins: \_\_\_\_\_. You're welcome.

Mr. Timmerman: Thank you very much.

Mr. Pernula: Thank you.