

Skagit County Planning Commission
Public Hearing: 2012 CPAs
November 5, 2013

(PUBLIC TESTIMONY ONLY)

C-1 (Amend Skagit County Comprehensive Plan to incorporate by reference the 2012 Skagit County Parks & Recreation Comprehensive Plan)

Randy Good
Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County
Liz McNett Crowl
Martha Bray, Skagit Land Trust
Carol Ehlers
Jeroldine Hallberg
Ed Stauffer
Ellen Cooley
Marie Erbstoesz

Randy Good: Good evening. Randy Good, G-o-o-d, 35482 State Route 20, Sedro-Woolley. After hearing – some comments were made and we did – the Parks Board did make a few changes that I recommended, and then after reviewing this document further I have some more concerns about it, so that's what I really wanted to address here.

We actually encourage the Planning Commission to recommend that this Park and Rec Plan be brought back and reviewed by the Planning Commission. With the over-fifty age group rapidly growing, with the park survey clearly showing needs for indoor facilities that we don't have, why the need for more trails? Questions have been raised: Is there a need for Chapter 5? And that's called "Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation." On page 5-11 of that, it says Trends and Concerns, quote – and so this is a quote: "Agricultural cultivation of these and former open lowlands has reduced species diversity, as has forest management in current and former wooded areas." End quote. Our concern is again just opinions and assumptions here – no science to back up these accusations, so really is there a need for Chapter 5 in this Parks and Rec Plan? Many other government agencies, non-profits, tribes, private are competing for these same grant monies. As we know, all grants have strings attached which are detrimental to recreation and to agriculture.

The Park and Rec Plan fails to address legal public process requirements, and property rights I think needs to be added into this Plan. And an example is the lack of legal public process on the Cascade Trail. No public process as required by the Skagit County Comp Plan policy, and actually funds from 102 are for non-motorized projects only, and these were the funds that were used.

The public's first knowledge of this paving project was April 29, 2013, on the County Commissioners' Consent Agenda. Input to this specific project was a few letters solicited by one or two trail promoters representing one civic group and given to the Parks Department, with most letters cc'd back to this individual. The letter from the Sedro-Woolley School District was never considered or approved by the Sedro-Woolley School District Board. Was the circumventing of the public process by the Parks Department, County Commissioners and County Administrator used to get around SEPA environmental review? Good question. Is this the Skagit County staff's pathetic attempt to claim that a legal public process was followed?

Chair Annie Lohman: Randy, your time has expired. Sorry.

Mr. Good: Okay, then I'll hand out a copy to each one of the Planning Commission members. Thanks.

Chair Lohman: Ellen Bynum, followed by Liz McNett Crowl.

Ellen Bynum: Good evening. Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County. Last name B-y-n-u-m and 110 South First Street, Mount Vernon.

I wanted to first address the accessibility of the Parks Plan to the public. I didn't have a copy – printed copy – of the Parks Plan and I quite like looking at printed copies. So wanting to, you know, print that out it took two hours on a home printer to print it out. So I don't know if that is something that most people would endure or do, and I don't know how you need to address the availability. I think in the past you – Brian probably had printed copies made available to the public and I think we don't do that as much now. So that's just a side comment.

The main concern that I have about the Plan is that I understand that you have certain requirements by the RCO or any other grantors that give you – that tell you things that they would like you to do. And one of those things has to do with continuity with GMA and planning and capital facilities. So often a parks plan or a drainage plan or a transportation plan has to be coordinated and mentioned in as being adopted before a granting agency will consider it for funding. And I'm not saying that you shouldn't have that but I do question the continued use of the suggestions in the templates that are given by the state agencies. I don't know that they're always appropriate. If they're not a legal requirement I would request that, you know, this be rethought and rewritten in a different way.

Because basically what has happened with this Plan is you have morphed – the Parks Department has morphed from a parks and recreation department into a conservation group. And my question is that, you know, it's okay to say you want to do those things within your park, but what is it going to be – what is it going to cost the public? Do you have the expertise on your staff to do this? No, so

you're probably going to be going out hiring consultants. And while this is a great idea for a jobs program and it's one of the reasons that we get grants to hire consultants to keep the economy going, this is not exactly what we had in mind for Parks and Rec. So while you would like to be able to put that information into your Plan so that the RCO would be able to consider you for habitat conservation projects that they might have in mind, I question whether the public even knows that that was added, and I would like to ask Patrik if there was any interface in the public – opportunities for the public to comment that describe the change in programming that you were proposing for habitat. Because I don't think people understand what that means. That's a totally separate animal to what you are doing in providing recreation. Now I might have read the Plan wrong but that's how I read it, and that's of concern.

Okay, so –

Josh Axthelm: Ellen, your time's up.

Ms. Bynum: Sure. I will provide additional comments, and I just want the Planning Commission to consider, you know Is it appropriate to approve a plan where the function of an agency has been changed without very much public comment? Thanks.

Chair Lohman: Okay, Liz McNett Crowl, followed by Martha Bray.

Liz McNett Crowl: Good evening. Liz McNett Crowl. McNett, M-c-n-e-t-t. Crowl, C-r-o-w-l, 13797 Trumpeter Lane, Mount Vernon, Washington. I am a Skagit County Parks and Recreation Advisory Board member and this is the third time I've had an opportunity to participate in a Comprehensive Plan update. I'm just here tonight to speak in favor of the Plan moving forward, and that I really appreciated the thoroughness of the process that the Parks Board went through and the opportunity for the Parks Board to be as involved as they were in this update, as well as the last updates.

I think that sometimes we overlook the role of Parks and Recreation and what they really bring to our community. It's not only recreation and an opportunity to enjoy these public properties but it also helps us maintain our health, and the health of the public is very important. And we know that by having public access to Parks and Recreation facilities that people are able to increase their physical activity which is conducive to preventing chronic disease and obesity. So that's my health hat.

I also think that the importance of Parks and Recreation and having a great place where people can enjoy the out-of-doors, as well as the indoor facilities, is what it brings to our county. A lot of us choose to live here because of what a great place it is. That includes the rural agriculture. It includes the great parks, not only the county parks but our city parks, as well as our national parks. And

there's a strong correlation between the quality of life and economic growth, so a lot of companies choose to come to Skagit County because of the facilities and the nearness that we have to these great facilities.

I also wanted to point out that there is consensus that trails are the most sought-after recreation facility from many sources of Skagit County public opinion repeatedly, whether it's the Open Space Plan or the last several Skagit County Parks Plans or the Mount Vernon update of their comprehensive parks plan. Over and over and over the public tells us again the importance of trails in their community and that they want them. And this is true of what the statewide analysis points out to us.

I also think that the public did have a lot of opportunity to participate in this planning process with the number of meetings that the Parks Board held, not only our monthly meetings where everyone had an opportunity to comment on the process but also the meetings that we held throughout the county. So I would encourage you to recommend the Plan be approved. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Okay, Martha Bray, followed by Carol Ehlers.

Martha Bray: Good evening. My name is Martha Bray, B-r-a-y. I represent Skagit Land Trust. We are at 1020 South Third Street in Mount Vernon. My home address is 6368 Erwin Lane, Sedro-Woolley. Skagit Land Trust protects open space, wildlife habitat, and working farms and forestland throughout Skagit County. We have partnered numerous times with many organizations in the county and several times with Skagit County Parks, and it's been a really productive working relationship that's certainly not competitive in any way. We're here tonight to speak in support of the Parks and Rec's Plan. I think it's a balanced Plan and a good one, and represents a lot of hard work on the part of a lot of individuals. And, in particular, I'd like to speak in support of the goals for trails, natural resources, open space, and water access, and for Chapter 5, Habitat Conservation. I think that this is an important piece of any plan that's going to address protecting the values that we all care about in Skagit County, and Skagit County has an important role to play in that. The County's Open Space Plan relies very heavily on non-profit work to protect open space in Skagit County and we can't do that without coordinating with local government, and it's an important piece of this.

And, again, I just want to emphasize that we're not competing and I don't think the Parks Department is trying to reinvent itself as a natural resources agency. The projects that we do with the Parks Department are very carefully thought out and they always involve public access. And we've done some great projects that allow for fishing and river access and access to trails, and we couldn't do those things without, you know, a really great Parks Department to work with.

So I think that's – and the other thing I wanted to just say is that numerous surveys and studies over and over again speak to how much the citizens of Skagit County value open space and trails. And we hear that from our members. We have a thousand household and business members in Skagit County, and over and over again what we hear is they want trails close to home and they want open space protected close to home. And all we have to do is look to Bellingham and to the west to Anacortes to see what an economic driver that protected open space is and how important it is to the future of our quality of life and to good jobs and good development here. So I urge you to adopt the Plan into the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan. Thanks.

Chair Lohman: Okay, thank you. Carol Ehlers, followed by Jeroldine Hebbler. Does that sound like somebody?

Jason Easton: I know that name!

Carol Ehlers: How do I get it bigger? Anyway. Push in? Okay. Carol Ehlers, E-h-l-e-r-s, Wind Crest Lane, West Fidalgo Island. I'm as much in favor of parks and trails as anyone in the room, but I'm very much in favor of due process and of the relationship of one plan to another plan, as mandated by GMA. The map that I show here is from the county trails map. It shows a trail going down Ginnett Road and then down Sharpe Road to Heart Lake Road and through the parks area. This area down Ginnett Road was the cause of an enormous uproar and huge meetings on Fidalgo Island because of the trespassing problem. I didn't go to them because I was then on the Planning Commission and I was going to listen when they came to us, but it quieted down. Then I see on this map all of a sudden it's here. You see, if there – according to state law – if there is no fence around a piece of property – entirely around, including the cliff or the edge of the lake – and no gate and no No Trespassing sign, you are free to go into almost any piece of property you want unless it's cropland. And if you steal something, it isn't burglary, it's theft. So there's a lot of people who want the consequence of a trail to be considered before it's approved. And that is why, as much as possible, when I was involved in doing trails planning we did it on public land where there was no question as to the fact you could trespass anywhere you wanted to. And that I would like you to continue because this was not agreed to by the people who lived around there, and that is not appropriate public process.

Now as far as GMA, all the plans that have been done in this county have come before the Planning Commission with a study session so that the things that have been said here tonight can be sent to the Planning Commission; the Planning Commission can ask questions. There's a lot of questions that were raised, or ought to be raised in people's minds. You had a study session and then, after a period of time, you then had a hearing like this one. When you ask people to write you have to give them a final document. You need to have a copy in paper some place and the way they used to do it was to send it to Office Depot for the

multi-copying place. They do it quite reasonably. I've had a number of things sent to me there. And then you have a paper copy and you can go from page 10 to page 40 and back and forth and see how it works. And usually you calm down a lot because what your initial impact is is, Well, they've modified this and they've explained it. And that's a process that actually involves the public. But this Plan has to relate to the Shoreline Plan, from what I've heard, and I don't know that it has. I've been to all the Shoreline meetings and I haven't heard any discussion of the relationship of this one to the proposed Shoreline one.

Mr. Axthelm: Carol, your time's up.

Ms. Ehlers: Okay. They *have* to relate, and it doesn't make sense for them *not* to relate. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Okay, Jeroldine Hamber, followed by Ed Stauffer.

Jeroldine Hallberg: Good evening. My name is Jeroldine Hallberg, spelled H-a-l-l-b-e-r-g, and my address is 6335 State Route 9, Sedro-Woolley. I'm here tonight to speak briefly in support of incorporation by reference of the 2012 Parks and Recreation Plan.

I worked for a time for the County and my last project was the 2009 Countywide UGA Open Space Plan, which you recommended adoption, and you had study sessions with large maps here in the room, and I just wanted to bring that to your attention because the two plans are related and I think when you incorporate by reference the Parks and Rec Plan we also out to have the – you know, the knowledge that the UGA Plan is in existence. I think the two of them will work well together, and I'm more convinced of that as I reviewed the Parks Plan online and became aware – sadly – again very mindful of the sobering information in the Parks Plan that financial support for County parks has declined by, I guess, about 50% or so. To me that's a dangerously low level. When we think about investing in these treasures for the future of the county we need to be adequately prepared for the demand that's certain to occur. Whether we ignore it or not, people will demand and will be using open space and parks and trails – all of the above.

I believe that the UGA Open Space Plan and the County Parks Plan can be used together as guidance documents. They can be used to develop future funding options to present to the citizens. In fact, the Open Space Plan went into great detail to talk about some options for funding open space.

So, in summary, as you move ahead as I hope you will, I think it would be very helpful to reference both planning documents. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Sorry about massacring your name!

Ms. Hallberg: It's okay.

Chair Lohman: Ed Stauffer. And if there's somebody after Ed that would like to speak but did not sign up, there will be an opportunity for you.

Ed Stauffer: Stauffer, S-t-a-u-f-f-e-r, Box 114, Bow, Washington. I'm signed up on the listserver for notices of meetings and I never got a listserver announcement of any Park Advisory Board meetings in the last several years. I did read all the minutes of all Parks Advisory Board committee meetings going back to the year 2007 before I found a reference that they had two consecutive meetings where they discussed the idea of the Open Space Plan revision, what you're now considering tonight for adoption. This has been laying in the weeds for a long time. It runs some 204 pages long. I would say in my estimation at least 95% of those pages are ideological ruminations. If you crossed those out you'd have left a very workable, usable Parks and Recreation Plan which we now have in place and which is used every day. One thing that it does leave out, in spite of the comments to the contrary tonight by staff, is we are, by RCW 36.70A, required to demonstrate consistency and congruency. Nowhere in this Plan or in the Open Space Plan – which, by the way, “open space” is an undefined concept; I challenge any of you to give me an operational definition of “open space.” None of these plans mention anywhere the rural landscape. You represent the people of rural Skagit County. The largest residential community in this county is the rural community – over 2000 homes. The needs, the rights, the responsibilities, the Rural Element of the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan, the rights and responsibilities, the quality of life and lifestyle that in your – the rural residents of Skagit County – are not addressed in these plans. Do not adopt them until they are. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Anybody else?

Ellen Cooley: Good evening. I'm Ellen Cooley, 16340 Lookout Lane – that's C-o-o-l-e-y – in Bow. And I wasn't going to say anything but in lieu of Ed Stauffer's comments and me living in Bow I think it would be in my best interest to back his comments or endorse them so that I as a rural resident am well served as possible. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Anybody else? Come on up.

Marie Erbstoesz: My name is Marie Erbstoesz, spelled E-r-b-s-t-o-e-s-z-e-r. I'm a resident of Mount Vernon, Washington, at 217 East Division. I've lived in this wonderful county for twenty – more than twenty-five years. We moved here in 1975. I'm interested in hearing what is going on tonight. I'm a member of the Active Community Task Force here in Skagit County and also the Urban Trails Committee in Mount Vernon. My career is in health care and health services. I certainly see where Parks and Recreation are important not only to making this a wonderful community to live in – that's what attracted us here in 1975 – but also

for the health and well-being and the economic development of the county. I think we have to look very broadly at the whole picture. I'm very encouraged about the Comp Plan and I certainly encourage the group here tonight to pass C-1, the proposal to amend the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan. I would encourage movement on that. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Anybody else?

(silence)

(Skip to comments on C-2.)

C-2 (Redesignate and rezone P118792 from Rural Resource-Natural Resource Land to Rural Reserve)

**Roger Noar
Carol Ehlers
Ed Stauffer**

Chair Lohman: Okay, (the) first speaker I have is Roger –

Roger Noar: Noar.

Chair Lohman: Noar, followed by Carol Ehlers.

Mr. Noar: My name is Roger Noar, N-o-a-r, and 6067 Central Avenue in South Fidalgo Island. I'm the President of the Board of Del Mar Community Service. We serve 300 homes. We're a private water system in rural South Fidalgo Island and those are our water tanks. And we are in favor of this proposal to rezone and make that tiny parcel consistent with all the surrounding parcels. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Thank you.

Ms. Ehlers: I'm Carol Ehlers, E-h-l-e-r-s, Wind Crest Lane. I'm also on the Board of this water system and I want to thank the Planning Department for recognizing the difficulty and dealing with it. It's exactly the kind of sensible thinking that, when it happens, one must say thanks.

Chair Lohman: Anybody else?

Mr. Stauffer: Ed Stauffer again, S-t-a-u-f-f-e-r, 114, Bow, Washington. I'd like to submit this as an example of where the process works. We started work on GMA in the early 1900s and we adopted the plan in 1996 – the original version. This adjustment to a rural land use is what we had in mind for being able to modify the plan in case an error was made that we needed room for correction. If you take a look at the number of these land use adjustments that have been

brought before the Planning Commission since 1996, I think you'll find that Skagit County's plan to prevent urban sprawl is working.

Chair Lohman: Anybody else?

(silence)

(No testimony was given on C-3, so skip to C-4.)

C-4 (Amend the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan)

Tim Rosenhan

Terica Taylor, Economic Development Association of Skagit County

Mike O'Donnell

Roger Howard, Burlington-Edison School Board

Mike Anderson, Mayor of Sedro-Woolley

Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County

Carol Ehlers

Jon Sitkin, Attorney for John Bouslog, Bayview Ridge Property Owner

Patsy Martin, Port of Skagit

Ellen Cooley

Chair Lohman: Okay, first up I have Tim Rosenhan, followed by Teresa Taylor.

Mr. Easton: Terica.

Chair Lohman: Terica Taylor.

Tim Rosenhan: My name is Tim Rosenhan, R-o-s-e-n-h-a-n. I live on Samish Island. I support the industrial rezone. I wanted to talk a little bit more generally about the proposed new town at – I may need a twelve-year-old to help me out with this. How do I get the slide show started? Now I'm fine. Thank you.

I have an aviation background. I've been a Marine Corps pilot. I've managed Skagit Regional Airport and I spent a career doing airport planning, mostly in airports in Puget Sound, including doing the master plans for NAS Whidbey Island. It makes me wonder why we would want to build a new town half the size of Sedro-Woolley, denser than any other town in Skagit, right under the flight pattern of a growing, regionally important airport. There have been a number of things change since that Bayview plan was first conceived fifteen years ago. First of all, the population pressure is a lot less than it used to be – certainly less than fifteen years ago. But also the airport's changed. Its mission has changed. The accidents and regulations are up at the airport.

First of all, looking at population figures this last decade's population growth is less than half what that percentage was in the previous decade. And now the

2012 Office of Financial Management projections show that out in twenty years we could have 25,000 fewer people in Skagit County than has been projected on the former growth curves. So there's less need to provide housing.

Also the airport has changed significantly. The airport did not used to have a mission statement, and the last couple of years the Port of Skagit County has created that mission statement and they now see it as a business airport similar to what they see as a model in Hillsboro, Oregon. They didn't have jet fuel fifteen years ago out there. They now have jet fuel. They now have a very credible instrument approach and they now have roughly one jet operation there per day.

The airport value of the area has been quantified by Washington State Department of Transportation at \$57 million per year economic impact to the region. A history of airports and housing conflict are all over Puget Sound. I mention four airports here: Anacortes, which is a poster child for bad airport planning; the outlying field at Coupeville, which is where the Navy practices carrier landings, is currently involved in a lawsuit with the local residents at Admiralty Cove suing the Navy because of guess what? Airport noise. Paine Field has trouble securing an air carrier for scheduled flights. That periodically comes up there because the people at Mukilteo object to noise and that continued amount of operations, and since it's a county-owned airport they're subject to political pressure that restricts them. And SeaTac I won't even get into much. It's just a sea of litigation because of nearby housing.

Mr. Axthelm: Your time is up.

Unidentified female voice in the audience: I'll give him my three minutes.

Mr. Easton: Can – Madame Chair?

Chair Lohman: Go ahead, Jason.

Mr. Easton: May I suggest that you submit your slides as part of the record?

Unidentified male voice in the audience: Will you give that to everybody that's in the room tonight then? I mean, mail it out to us?

Chair Lohman: Could we put this on the website?

Same unidentified male voice: He had some very good valid points.

Mr. Easton: Sir? You can't be heard by the folks at home so – the question from the audience was: Can these comments that I've asked to be put on the record be available by the website? I believe in the past that we do take the – we take the public comment and post it on the website so that every – all things that are

written – submitted writingly – will be attached to this on the website. Is that correct?

Mr. Johnson: Right. The public comment period runs through Thursday so typically what we do is we wait until the public comment period closes –

Mr. Easton: And then post it?

Mr. Johnson: We alphabetize the comments and then we post them. So it probably wouldn't be up until Friday.

Mr. Easton: Okay. I mean, it'll be available.

Mr. Rosenhan: Jason, I have submitted a letter.

Ms. Bynum: I think the pleasure of the audience is to hear the presentation, if you would allow that, Madam Chair.

Ms. Ehlers: Besides, Tim, weren't you the one who was at that Transportation meeting that _____ and the others were at?

Chair Lohman: I'm sorry. We – excuse me – we published that it was three minutes of oral testimony and unlimited on written, so can you summarize your remarks and then we'll move on to the next person?

Mr. Rosenhan: Okay. I just wanted to say that there have been accidents at the airport. That's also a factor as well as the noise conflicts. I have submitted a report to Annie and that contains all my presentation for tonight. Thank you.

Mr. Easton: I'm asking for something in addition to the letter that you submitted, Tim. I'm asking that you could –

Chair Lohman: This PowerPoint.

Mr. Easton: – put the PowerPoint on the record so that we could review it, if that's – is that something you could turn over to the County between now and 7:30 on Thursday?

(laughter)

Mr. Rosenhan: Possibly.

Mr. Easton: Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. The next speaker is Terica Taylor, followed by Mike O-something. Is it O'Donnell?

Mr. Easton: Is there a Mike O'Donnell?

Mike O'Donnell: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Okay.

Chair Lohman: Terica?

Terica Taylor: My name's Terica Taylor. That's T-a-y-l-o-r, and my address is 204 West Montgomery in Mount Vernon, Washington. I work for the Economic Development Association of Skagit County and I'm here specifically to talk about the 110-acre – er, is it acres? I forgot.

Mr. Easton: Yes.

Ms. Taylor: – related to the new industrial zoning. And we want to share our support for industrial zoning in general in Skagit County, because as we work to bring companies to the region it's important for us to have these things in place *before* they begin to look. And right now we have about thirty active companies that we're working with that are in expansion or relocation mode and they need to have these industrial zones available to them to be built upon. So it's very important to us that this moves forward in a timely manner so that we can move forward with these companies that we're working with. And I'm *only* here to speak about that area of the Bayview Ridge Plan. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. Roger Howard is after Mr. O'Donnell. No, you're next. You're next, sir. I was just telling the next person behind you.

Mr. O'Donnell: Mike O'Donnell, capital O-apostrophe-capital D-o-n-n-e-l-l, 12674 Wedgewood Drive, Burlington. It continues to baffle me why you would build a community where there's 1000 acres of probably the prime industrial land between Vancouver, B.C. and Everett, Washington; why you would put a high density, low income housing up there; why you would put the burden of all the development on existing taxpayers because it *will* end up as part of the low income housing of Skagit County, which does not pay any taxes. We already have over 200 units in the Burlington School District that were paid for. Why you would do that. People have not supported you. The only people that support you are yourselves. You keep moving forward. This was done back in 1996. Why you don't review it as of today I'll never understand.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. Roger Howard, followed by Mike Anderson.

Roger Howard: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Roger Howard, H-o-w-a-r-d. My address is 18449 Andis Place in Burlington. I am the President of the Burlington-Edison School Board. We have been watching this development

very closely. It obviously will have a significant economic impact to the Burlington School District. We've been working with the Skagit County Board of Commissioners and the Skagit County Planning Department on trying to find a suitable site for a future school that will be driven by the population anticipated by this development. It has been a significant challenge to try to find a suitable site at that development area due to the recent information from the Department of Transportation's Aviation Division on siting schools in an area of this type of development.

I do have to say that we are in support of the Subarea Plan amendment and we appreciate your review and scrutiny of this development as you have been doing, and we hope to contribute and be involved in future discussions on this development. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Okay, Mike Anderson, followed by Ellen Bynum.

Mike Anderson: My name's Mike Anderson, A-n-d-e-r-s-o-n. My address is 325 Metcalf, Sedro-Woolley, Washington. I'm speaking mostly about the population growth. I think it's a bad idea to develop the Bayview Ridge population. I think you, acting as planners, you need to think out a hundred years, unless we're talking about moving the airport, which I don't think we are. I see potential conflicts, as Tim's speaking about.

What I want to know is: Why are we spending millions of County tax dollars on this development? Are we doing it to benefit owners of some ag land so they can build condos and apartments? I think this directly would – this development would directly compete with our cities, which are already set up for it. I have heard talk about the future population growth coming to Skagit County in the next fifty years as a reason. Suppose we build a community of 5000 at Bayview View that shop in Burlington. More sales tax for Burlington. Good for Burlington. How do you pay for the daily costs that this proposed community would generate? You have police, fire, schools, parks, roads, administration, et cetera. Does the County provide these services at the expense of everyone else in the county? Do you raise property taxes countywide to support this pocket of growth? I think this has been discussed many times before ___ Growth Management Act.

Take it from a mayor of a city that has funding issues. You need a community that has balanced revenue sources using local property taxes, especially one having a vibrant sales tax. In the future the community proposed at Bayview Ridge would have the same funding problems that Sedro-Woolley currently has unless it creates its own identity large enough of a population to support commercial activity. It will be too close to Burlington's commercial stores to have its own stores and thus no sales tax to help provide the necessary services.

Now I'm going to put on my Sedro-Woolley Mayor hat on. Our city is preparing for future growth and we've spent 35 to 40 million in the last seven years

upgrading our sewer system, running our new lines up Duke Hill to the new middle school; new fire station, too, including fire equipment; a new city hall, including our streets, roads and systems; acquiring acres of more park land; running sidewalks. We are just located four miles east of I-5. We're not in Montana. We're in Skagit County. The land is all ready to develop. We're out of the floodway; we're not taking farmland like Bayview Ridge is; we have utilities available; our schools are built – and I believe they're the best in Skagit County. We're ready to grow, so why spend County time, resources and taxpayers' money to build another duplicate infrastructure and compete with us? It doesn't make sense unless you're one of the current property owners. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. Ellen Bynum, followed by Carol Ehlers.

Ms. Bynum: Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County, 110 North First Street. Mayor Anderson has an interesting point that the cities are certainly spending money. One of the goals of GMA was a concept called concurrency and that basically means that you do have those kinds of services and utilities available at the time that you allow development. The cost of concurrency is generally thought to be better paid for by developers, that is, the people who are wanting to do the development. Now hold that in your mind when you ask yourself the question: The 110 acres is going to be a part of the county; it's not going to be a part of the Port; the County is going to pay for the concurrency costs of the 110 acres, or are they going to secure developers who pay for that?

The Planning Commission has upon a few occasions noted that it is better if you have cost-sharing and it is *best* if you have the developer pick up the tab for that. So my question to the Planning Commission is, Do you have any indication of who's paying and what we get for it if the public has to pay for the concurrency costs for the development? And I'm talking about for the whole of Bayview Ridge as well as the industrial areas. I do understand the reason you'd like to consider the 110 rezone, because you get more tax dollars off of industrial. And face it: The County is going to be out of money if it continues to cede its taxable land to the cities, which is going to happen eventually. So then we're going to be talking about cost-sharing with the cities which none of the cities want to talk about.

But that's a problem for the future. I think now we need to really, seriously look at the cost of concurrency. It appears to be undiscussed at, you know, at any kind of detailed level, and I don't know if that's because the County hasn't made a commitment or a budgetary commitment to doing it or if you haven't secured a developer to do the development. So that's of concern to me. Otherwise I think it makes more sense to have industrial land there than to have schools and houses. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Carol Ehlers, followed by Jon Sitkin.

Ms. Ehlers: There's courses in how you manage these things, but I didn't take them. Carol Ehlers, E-h-l-e-r-s, Wind Crest Lane, West Fidalgo Island. The Bayview Ridge Plan has been discussed at some length ever since 1959, and fortunately nothing was done fifty years ago because we had no concept of what the airport could become; we had no concept the railroads would be restored; State Route 20 was a nightmare to drive under any circumstances. It was a mirror whenever it rained, and you know how that's like. And the discussion in those days was having quarter-acre lots all over the surface because everyone knew that with that clay mesa it wasn't good farmland and it wasn't good forestland. And there's an EIS from 1972 with quarter-acre zoning.

What is proposed now is light years better and I think is – for the industrial area – is absolutely exciting. You have a situation in which an airport with a good deal of imagination and leadership – things that Tim Rosenhan brought up were brought up at a transportation meeting that I mentioned last time and no one wanted to hear about. The railroad is crucial. SCOG has a plan regarding transportation, which is one of the essential concurrencies no matter what you do. Even if you don't do anything you have to plan the transportation, the road transportation. That SCOG document is very detailed but it doesn't know there is any east-west railroad in this county, much less one that blocked Farm to Market Road with a parked train the other day and clogged up Best Road because the light wouldn't change from red, and the people on Best Road going north couldn't go anywhere. So it was this long line of cars and trucks. Somebody's got to start thinking of the relationship of air, rail, and road, and a road engineer that works for the County is not trained in dealing with those three areas. And I'm not suggesting hiring a consultant; I'm suggesting thinking among staff that are already here.

Now that it's talked about for industrial, all sorts of things are appearing. AT&T is planning to put up a real cell tower. Just think of the area that could have decent cell service now that doesn't have it.

The flight museum is coming. There's been a lot of visits by various ancient airplanes that a lot of us have gone to, and now they're talking about moving the flight museum from Bellingham to the airport. So it's a kind of the imaginative use of the airport that has never occurred before, and that's a changing condition that I think is very good. There was an article the other day in the paper that they really high speed Internet – broadband – up there, which is not common in this county. If you go on the Internet and you have a big enough computer and you got enough time you can download the U.S. broadband map and then the state broadband map and then the county broadband map and you find it's not a pretty picture.

Mr. Axthelm: You're out of time.

Ms. Ehlers: They did it once here.

Mr. Axthelm: Carol, you're out of time.

Ms. Ehlers: Okay. That is Josh Wilson Road. It's got a connection to the Interstate. It's part of what has to be widened.

Chair Lohman: Thank you.

Ms. Ehlers: And I want to turn this in as a document. I understand it can only be 8½ by 11. The legend down below says it's a federal map, 2003, and this declaration that this is an urban growth area is why we justified the whole Growth Management thing in Bayview. You can cut it to your size as you wish.

Chair Lohman: Thank you, Carol. Jon Sitkin, followed by Patsy Martin.

Jon Sitkin: Thank you, Madame Chairman. I have a letter to submit. I've given the original to Ryan Walters and if I could pass this out to the Commission, if we have time. May I approach?

Chair Lohman: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Sitkin: When you're in court, you ask to approach the bench!

Mr. Easton: You really sound like a lawyer when you talk like that, Jon!

Chair Lohman: Scare us!

Mr. Sitkin: Jon Sitkin, 1500 Railroad Avenue, Bellingham. So I'd like to take an opportunity to address just the issues before you and not other issues. I'm welcome to that debate on what appropriate airport overlay zones are, and that's a subject of a lot of interpretation and debate. But what's before you is the industrial zoning. And I appreciate the comments and I would love to – I haven't heard anyone come out in opposition to the request. I've got a question of concern but no one thus far, and I'm not anticipating Patsy to oppose the request, but I'm aware that I'm not hearing any opposition.

But I want to address a couple of questions. One I think we talked in response to questions before, but developer contribution to the development of infrastructure. I appreciate the concurrency comments that were made and that's an essential part of your ordinance in Skagit County that has developed is a series of concurrency regulations as part of your code now. And the way the extension and development of infrastructure would be is that the developer would work with the service provider – water, sewer, for instance – to extend any mains at the developer's cost to the property to serve the property. Any road improvements that would be necessary, onsite roads, the developer to develop. If there's any capacity on the existing roads, the developer would work to pay for their fair

share of that. If they need expansion, they'd pay for their fair share of that expansion, work with the Public Works Department through the processes through a reimbursement agreement or other process to ensure that the adequate services exist. So there are structures through the environmental review process, through agreements with the service providers as conditions of extension, where the developer pays for those infrastructure developments and their fair share. They don't have to cure deficiencies, and that's the misnomer. If there's a deficiency of existing systems – be it roads, storm – a new developer doesn't have to cure deficiencies, but they do pay for their impact.

And it was addressed or questions raised by the Mayor – is he still here? Ah, he may have run to see the election counts – but others about the fiscal impact study. And I'd ask you, if you look at the addendum that just came out – the original fiscal impact study for Bayview Ridge – but go back to the 2012 fiscal impact study that was prepared by ECONorthwest for Skagit County and Growth Management implications. There they encourage the high density development in Skagit County because of the economies of scale to spread the cost of services over a greater number of units. You come to – and particularly with Public Works and road reimbursement costs for maintenance and operations. That was one of their points there. When you look at the fiscal impact study and the addendum they said, Well, they looked at a per-mile cost. Well, of course a per-mile cost throughout the whole county could be greater than just doing it per-unit cost in an area of an urban area for roads and maintenance. Just an interesting way you might approach the statistics – the road costs that were provided to you by Public Works. In a number of cases those segments that were provided to you in the fiscal impact study included water and sewer utilities that would be included in the road cost. Well, those should be stripped out. Those would be a developer cost. I point that out because there was an assumption of a 50% developer contribution to all the costs of infrastructure. When you really get into it you could pull out more than 50% and, you know, we're all cowboy mathing it, but I think it'd be higher when you pull out the water and sewer but put the developer contributions to all the infrastructure that would be developed. For instance, the north-south connector that would primarily be a private or a combination of Port cost to go to that northern extension. That wouldn't necessarily be a County extension.

I'm going beyond the industrial discussion, going larger into the fiscal impact study of the whole Bayview Ridge development, but I wanted to bring those points out to you because that is part of your record. I address them briefly here.

We support the 100 acres –

Mr. Axthelm: Three minutes.

Mr. Sitkin: I didn't hear anybody tell me, but I appreciate that if it is. I'll cut it off at three minutes. We support the proposal. Thank you. I saw the notice for three minutes, too, and I tried to ___ my time.

Chair Lohman: Okay. Patsy Martin.

Mr. Axthelm: I've allowed a little bit of time here and there for names, so I do let you get through your names!

Mr. Sitkin: Thank you. Thank you very much. I'm ___ – fair is fair.

Patsy Martin: Hi, I am Patsy Martin with the Port of Skagit, M-a-r-t-i-n, at Post Office Box 348, Burlington, Washington. I'm here to talk a little bit about the proposal, but more importantly talk a little bit about the Port. Our purpose is good jobs for the Valley. We've tried to do many, many different things to do that but what's specific to Bayview Ridge (is) back in 1996 we teamed together with Skagit County, with private landowners, with the school district, with the fire district and with many other entities to appropriately plan for Bayview Ridge. And we put together the best plan we knew how in 1996, and we've been living with that, we've been growing beautifully, and some of Tim's comments reflect that. And with that growth comes other things like accidents that we have to deal with.

As a part of all that planning, we all adopted some safety overlay zones that tried to put a framework around that airport to make sure it doesn't have the problems that Anacortes has, to make sure that we can continue to grow the way we need to. We've also ___ that, as I said.

Now Washington State Department of Transportation has come in, not necessarily at any of our requests, and said that they have updated information based on more current accident data. That information has put different lines on a map. We're willing to work with everybody to try to understand how that affects us all, but we will be respecting those lines on the map for two reasons: one, safety. As we understand, they're based on accident data and we want to understand how that affects all of us but we will be paying attention to that. Two, a practical reason: 95% of all the money we get to put capital improvements in our airport come from the Federal Aviation Administration and Washington State Department of Transportation Aviation Division. With that comes a thing that we sign called assurances. We sign a document that says we will fight against incompatible land uses, and when they have shown us on a map that something is incompatible we will respect that. So I just need to make sure that you guys understand that. But we will continue to work with everyone as we have since 1996 to have the best plan for that region as we can. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Okay, is there anybody else who did not sign up that wishes to speak? Come on up.

Ms. Cooley: I'm Ellen Cooley again, 16340 Lookout Lane, Bow, and I am very pro the industrial rezone. I have strong reservations about building housing out there and a school, given the four pipelines that cross there and the accident data that Tim put forth. And thank you.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. Anybody else?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Okay, seeing none we will close the public hearing on the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan.