

**Skagit County Planning Commission  
Work Session: Stormwater Code Update  
April 26, 2022**

**Planning**

**Commissioners:** Kathy Mitchell (absent)  
Mark Knutzen  
Vince Henley  
Amy Hughes  
Tim Raschko, Chair  
Joe Woodmansee (online)  
Tammy Candler, Vice Chair  
Martha Rose  
Jennifer (Jenny) Hutchison

**Staff:**

Hal Hart, Planning Director  
Peter Gill, Senior Planner/Manager  
Jenn Rogers, Assistant Long-Range Planner  
Andy Wargo, Public Works Stormwater Review Technician

Chair Tim Raschko: (gavel) Good evening, everybody, and welcome to the April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2022, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission. And welcome, everybody, for real! I mean, it's really nice to see people after a long, long absence, and Jen for the first time, and everybody here. So I'd ask for a motion to approve the minutes of April 12<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Martha Rose: So moved.

Vice Chair Candler: Second.

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's moved and seconded to approve the minutes of April 12<sup>th</sup>. Is there any discussion of the minutes/changes?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Hearing none, all those in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. So that passes. I neglected to do a roll call. I believe we have everybody present. Joe is online. Just be noted that we do not have Commissioner Mitchell. Okay, Peter, is there anybody who has dialed in to this meeting from the public?

Peter Gill: I'm not seeing anyone.

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's time for Public Remarks. There's nobody in the room. There's nobody online. Unless somebody from staff wishes to address the Planning Commission? It doesn't look like it so we'll move right on again to our main agenda item, which is a Stormwater Code Update Work Session. So Mr. Gill, please. Go ahead.

Mr. Gill: Good evening, Planning Commission members. It's nice to see everybody in person. This is great. I'm Peter Gill, Planning and Development Services, for the record. We also have tonight Hal Hart, Director; Jenn Rogers, Long Range Planning; Andy Wargo, with Stormwater; and Shawn Christensen, with Stormwater, here tonight to help me out.

For this meeting we did distribute a set of – a short memo, very short this time – nice – that basically provide an overview of what has been distributed so far, because there has been a lot of different materials, right? And so I thought it'd be useful to kind of refresh what you have for consideration so far with regards to stormwater requirements. And then Andy is going to provide an overview of some of the – or kind of more of a *visual* illustration of some of the changes that are being proposed with stormwater code. Maybe it's an easier way to understand how these changes may affect folks.

So let me share the screen here. And so working off of the memo, the first thing that was distributed at the first meeting on stormwater in March was the Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permit. That's the NPDES Stormwater Permit. And in there is the background on why the proposed changes are being proposed and our requirement as a county to stay in compliance with the stormwater permit.

The next thing that was included in that first meeting was the existing stormwater review worksheet with the building packet. And this document is helpful for understanding what the public would do in assessing what stormwater requirements are when they turn in their building application. So I'm not going to go through all of it because you've had it a while and you understand and that would take a long time to go, but I guess part of the point of providing you with this is to illustrate the complexity by which someone would have to understand where they are and what location and what stormwater requirements apply to them when building – the permit. So this Part 3 is really helpful for understanding that. And so that's all I'm going to say about that.

The third thing that was distributed at that first meeting was our handout for our existing clearing and grading permit requirements. And this we've talked about at the meetings in the past. There has been maybe some misunderstanding about the land disturbance code and how many of those requirements are actually new, and so this handout shows you what our existing requirements are currently. And so as you go down this, we talk about critical areas and avoiding clearing related to critical areas; conserving land; grading requirements, so fill and grade and how much excavation would require a permit; let's see, the felling of trees/cutting trees and what requires a forest practice permit; and conversions, so when someone does cut trees for development purposes, that is considered a conversion from one use to another and so that requires review by the County. If it is not being converted, it is under the DNR's jurisdiction completely. So that's an important part of that whole conversation about forest clearing. And stormwater management here, and that's where we get into the clearing requirements that we are proposing.

So that is what the existing – kind of (an) overview of what's required with the clearing and grading permit. And just to remind you, this is only if you are not seeking a building permit already. So all these things apply when you come in for a building permit but if you are just working on clearing the land you are also required to get a grading permit – right? And that's what it is now and we're proposing to change that from a grading permit to a land disturbance permit. And so that is why that handout is there.

At the last meeting, we distributed in the memo a matrix that compared the existing current code requirements to what is being proposed under the proposal, and it's broken down here on which

sections. So here we're looking at definitions. And then notes about those changes and maybe why those changes are being proposed.

The next section was Land Divisions – Land *Disturbance* here. And so this is one of those things where the requirements for those clearing and grading requirements exist today and where that handout came from. What we're doing is taking those existing standards and putting them in one place under Land Disturbance Code.

And then the meat of this is under 14.32, which is Stormwater Management, and then I've gone through section by section and tried to show where what the difference is between those two. And I think this was requested by Commissioner Woodmansee. Anyway, so that's in here now and you should be able to look up the section of code there to get a better understanding of the specifics there.

So also in that memo after the matrix were the actual code changes, right? So this is a development code and we have a clean version of what's proposed and then we have a marked-up version, and so the marked-up version will show you all the specific changes. But it is also very hard to digest because there's quite a few strikethroughs and underlines.

So the first one is on the Definitions, Land Divisions and Land Disturbance Code. And then the next section we have a clean copy of the Stormwater Management Code, and then we have the marked-up version. And so this is helpful if you want to see the nitty-gritty of what language actually changed. A lot of the language changes have to do with connecting it back to that NPDES permit. Some of it was moved. Different sections were moved to fit in better with the overall process that we go through now. So that is in there as well and there's a lot of it. I think we've got 78 pages between the matrix and the code and so it's a lot, it's a lot.

And then for tonight's meeting, we gave you the memo, which gave you an overview of those documents that have been distributed so far. But I also included our existing site plan checklist. And this isn't so that you know exactly what needs to be on every site plan that we take in, but it was mostly for you to see what the stormwater requirements are in those site plans. So it talks about showing the location of the stormwater systems, roof drains, floor drains, large trees onsite, and then the temporary erosion and sediment control measures, so those stormwater measures that are intended to only be in place at least during the construction period. So, like silt fences and things that you'd see on a construction site, those need to be shown on a \_\_\_.

And then the last one was an illustration that I think for those that aren't familiar with looking at site plans will be helpful tonight, because Andy is going to go through some basic type site plans to show how these changes affect folks on the ground. And so what you see here is basically those dark, black lines represent parcel boundaries, so that's the outside of the boundary. You've got your residences, existing buildings, proposed buildings that are shown; different dimensions; slope; topography of the actual parcel; driveway; stormwater facilities; things like that. So this is – imagine you're flying over in a plane looking down on the ground. That's what you're looking at here: the site plans.

So those are the documents that have been distributed so far through this review. And we are jumping into kind of process now. We do have one more meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup> of May to kind of talk through some of your questions maybe and provide you some more background on the details of the changes. And then we have scheduled a – well, and we will have the actual staff report available at the next meeting as well. And so that'll be really helpful for your kind of overview and understanding.

And then for the 24<sup>th</sup> of May, which is the second meeting in May, we will have the public hearing on this, and that will close that same day. So that is scheduled for the 24<sup>th</sup>. We do have some public meetings for the public, building industry, and others that are interested in these proposals, and that's what's shown on the screen here. We have meetings set up for this Thursday at six o'clock and Friday at 8:30 a.m., and we've been getting the word out on that, and they're virtual so they're fairly easy to pop into just to give people an idea of what's being proposed and how they can formally comment on what the proposal is. So those are happening this week.

And so I think that is all from me on this item now, so I am – if anyone has any questions on what's been distributed or anything I've talked about so far, I am going to jump over and let Andy talk about some of the site examples that he's prepared – unless anyone has any questions.

(silence)

Mr. Gill: Okay. Great.

Andy Wargo: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Andrew Wargo with the Planning Department, Stormwater Review, and I just want to follow up from our last meeting where I focused on the substantive changes with these proposed code updates. And I want to provide some site plan examples to kind of demonstrate how this will work, and I'm focusing on examples of residential sites outside of our NPDES permit area. That's where the substantive – most of the substantive changes proposed would occur. Inside the NPDES area and non-residential projects are almost exactly the same as in the existing code, so this is where the actual changes are. So I want to focus on some details of what that would actually look like on some site plans and how these requirements could be met.

So starting off, a little background: We talked about thresholds and project size. So there's a certain threshold inside the NPDES area. If you have a project that has 2,000 or more square feet of impervious surface you require minimum requirements 1 through 5, and that's considered a small project. And then once you hit 5,000 square feet of impervious surface that triggers all nine minimum requirements of the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. That's considered a large project. A lot of residential projects, most of them are considered small projects, and then outside – and those thresholds I just mentioned are inside the NPDES area – outside the proposed threshold is doubled. Instead of 2,000, it would be 4,000 feet for a small project and 10,000 feet for a large project. And like I said, most of the – most residential projects are small and their minimum requirements are 1 through 5. And minimum requirement number 5 in the Stormwater Management Manual is onsite stormwater management, meaning you can't just – you need to manage your stormwater runoff onsite from your roof and your driveway typically – patios, as well. Roof and driveway and parking are the big sources of impervious surface and stormwater runoff, and you can manage those with predesigned BMPs set forth by the Department of Ecology. The design is – you just need to calculate the square footage of impervious surface and the sizing is calculated based off of that, and you do not need an engineer for that. Sometimes you would need a geotechnical report if you're going to put it on steep slopes, but it's a non-engineered project typically.

So with that, I'll go through these. I have five examples here of different sites. So this first one would be on a lot smaller than 1 acre outside the NPDES area. And the total proposed impervious surface is over 5,000 square feet, so that would trigger – that's over 4,000 square feet; that would trigger minimum requirements 1 through 5. And the way the code is currently written, at 4,000 square feet it would trigger all nine. So for these smaller, less-than-1-acre parcels, the proposed code would actually relax the threshold so they wouldn't actually need to get an engineered plan

until they hit 10,000 square feet or 50% of the lot. Right now they actually – the way the code is written, they would actually need to hire an engineer and meet all nine requirements at 4,000 square feet. So this was providing a little bit more flexibility but still requiring them to manage the stormwater onsite at lower levels of impervious surface. So in this example, to meet minimum requirement number 5, they have a driveway with 1,800 square feet and they're able to just slope their driveway off to one side and have 10 feet of vegetated surface off to the lower side of the driveway, and that's considered a dispersion, \_\_\_-flow dispersion. That's considered managing it onsite, as opposed to putting it in a ditch and sending the runoff out to the County road, which happened before stormwater requirements were put into place but they're no longer acceptable. And then for the roof runoff in this case, what they're doing is sending it – they're piping it to a 46-foot long dispersion trench and then the dispersion ditch overflows and that needs a 25-foot vegetated dispersion area. So that's just a – and the 46-foot dispersion trench is a calculation based upon the amount of roof area. So that's how that's determined. And the design of the trench is a standard design provided by the Department of Ecology.

And then so we get to 1 acre *outside* the NPDES area, and it's a similar situation. The driveway, they're able to slope it off to the side. The house is a little bit bigger so they need to split up their roof runoff into two trenches because the maximum length of a dispersion trench is 50 feet. So they'll have a 50-foot trench on one side of their house and a 16-foot one on the other side of their house, both with 25-foot vegetated dispersion areas. And the vegetated dispersion area, it can be lawn, landscaping, or natural vegetation. So just having these in a lawn or landscaping is acceptable. In this case, for the lots greater than 1 acre, this threshold actually – the proposed threshold is tightened up somewhat from the existing threshold. The way it is currently is there's no stormwater planning required until they hit a 7,000 square foot impervious surface, and this brings it down to 4,000 square feet to require minimum requirements 1 through 5, and it aligns the less-than-1-acre and the more-than-1-acre. So it's a consistent requirement and consistent thresholds for all residential lots outside the NPDES area. The current code has a split where 1-acre or greater lots have different thresholds than less than 1-acre, and this code proposes to mesh them together, make them the same and hopefully more clear.

And then we get to another typical lot size, which is the 5-acre lot. And there's a lot more room here so this would be the similar one. In this one they're proposing to – between the house and the driveway it's 7,500 square feet, so they're over the 4,000-foot threshold and they're less than the 10,000-foot threshold, so they can do a similar pattern with some \_\_\_ flow dispersion off their driveway and the trenches split up between a 50-foot trench and a 22-foot dispersion trench. And \_\_\_ examples I'm talking about dispersion trenches. They're a typical tool. There's a small suite of standard stormwater BMPs provided by Ecology. There's also infiltration trenches. Those are used occasionally but they're not very common in the county because our soils don't support infiltration feasibility so they're not often used. And so a dispersion trench or even – and then the other one is the splash box – downspouts to splash box – which would just be off the corners of a house to deal with roof runoff is often – is acceptable as well. And it can be used if the landscape permits it.

Then I also wanted to throw in an example of a residential lot that would create – would meet all nine minimum requirements in the Stormwater Management Manual. This is a 5-acre lot. It's a longer driveway they're building on the back of the lot. Between the driveway – and then they have a larger shop – so between their driveway, their shop, and their house, and attached garage, they're up over the 10,000-foot threshold and they're proposing 7,000 square feet of impervious surface. In this case they need to meet more minimum requirements, so the simple – this is the one where they actually need – they would need to hire a professional and have an engineered drainage report prepared that demonstrates compliance with all nine minimum requirements. And

in this case, they are using full dispersion, which can be used on larger lots. So this is just an example. The dispersion pathway off the driveway and off the dispersion trenches needs to be 100 feet long. It needs to be either planted or maintained in natural vegetation and typically conserved in a protective easement. So it gets a little bit more involved once all nine minimum requirements are met. There's other ways of meeting this. They can also use bioretention or bioswales or cells, and they need to be engineered and they need to pass through the hydrology model in order to deal with the stormwater at this more involved \_\_\_. So that's just an example of a site that meets the threshold for all nine minimum requirements and an engineered drainage plan.

And then moving on, it's also – I wanted to show an example of a smaller lot and kind of throw in a little bit of complexity. So, you know, the first series are just kind of showing slope and a blank slate. All sites tend to be a little bit more complex. Lots of times there's wetlands, wetland buffers, streams – that you can't discharge directly to wetlands or streams. Septic drain fields also are limitations in how stormwater can be managed. It's not acceptable to disperse or infiltrate stormwater uphill from a septic drain field. Steep slopes provide problems too. They can be used to disperse stormwater but typically a report/approval letter from a geotech is required to install a dispersion trench on a slope steeper than 15%. And then the 100-foot radius of wellhead protection zone is restricted for – you can disperse within it but you can't infiltrate stormwater within that. So this is an example that – with these limitations of slopes, critical areas, septic drain fields, setbacks from property lines, it becomes more challenging to figure out how to fit these on. And that's a big part of the reason why we want to make this more clear and more comprehensive and bring stormwater into the forefront of the planning process. So when people are designing their site they can – they'll be able to have this information and design accordingly so they can handle their stormwater onsite and meet all the requirements that apply to their development.

That's all I have.

Hal Hart: Okay, great. I was just going to say through the Chair is questions.

Chair Raschko: Are there questions? I have some questions. Can you explain again – what do you call that? You know, the concrete block at the bottom of the downspout?

Mr. Wargo: That's a splash block.

Chair Raschko: A splash block. So it showed that those are actually legal?

Mr. Wargo: They can be used to manage stormwater onsite, yes. The specifications are that each splash block can receive no more runoff – runoff from no more than 700 square feet of roof area. So you need to have enough splash blocks to account for however large your roof is. And then it needs a 50-foot vegetative flow path away from the building. So as long as those are met, yes, those are acceptable BMPs for meeting the minimum requirement for onsite stormwater management.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Thank you. I was just wondering if you could explain a little more about dispersion versus infiltration. The way I view that, dispersion is making it run across the ground but you eventually want it to go into the ground. Isn't that infiltration then?

Mr. Wargo: As far as the regulations are concerned, as long as you – there typically is some infiltration and that is the ultimate goal of dispersion. As far as meeting the requirement, if you disperse – as long as you are dispersing along the specified flow path, it's considered dispersed

and you've met the requirement as far as stormwater requirements go for a stormwater plan. But yeah, that would be – but yeah, there would be typically some infiltration associated with that. But it's not required to meet the minimum requirement if you're using dispersion.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so the infiltration, that's where you actually dig a ditch then. It would be like a French drain that doesn't collect water but disperses it?

Mr. Wargo: Infiltration trench – it's – there's a couple different ways. The standard models, the standard designs are a dry well, which is – you know, it's more cylindrical-shaped and it's deeper, and then an infiltration trench, which is a trench and it has a perforated pipe running through it. The length of the pipe is dictated both by the size of the area you're infiltrating and also by the soil types. The more permeable the soils, the shorter the length of the infiltration trench can be.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Mr. Wargo: So and just one note. Your question about infiltration and dispersion: So that's one distinction between inside the NPDES area. So *inside* the NPDES area there's a list approach for meeting minimum requirement number 5, and it's required by the Stormwater Management Manual *and* our permit that infiltration is at the top of the list. That needs to be used first unless it's proven infeasible, and usually a septic soil log can prove infeasibility just based on depth to groundwater, depth to a limiting surface. And then you have to go through infeasibility too, and then farther down on the list are the dispersion BMPs. Where outside the NPDES area on these examples that I'm providing, the developer/landowner has the choice to use any acceptable BMP to meet – to manage stormwater onsite. The only limitation would be stub-out connections, which have limitations in their ability to maintain stormwater onsite.

Chair Raschko: Okay. I don't want to beat this to death, but is the desired result then of dispersion to get the water to move away farther, rather than have it become groundwater onsite?

Mr. Wargo: That's part of the goal. The big goal, though, is to disperse it so it doesn't leave the site in a concentrated way. So if it's dispersed, you'll get some infiltration and when it does flow off the site ideally whatever doesn't infiltrate before it hits a property line it'll be in smaller amounts spread across a larger area. If it's not dispersed and it stays concentrated that's when it can leave the property in a concentrated form within an increased volume and an increased flow rate, cause erosion, flooding, other property damage downstream. So it's really about protecting downstream property value, human health and safety, and the environment, natural resources as well. So it's about – yeah, it's about controlling – mitigating the effects from increased, concentrated flow rates and volumes as a result of new, impervious surface. That's the overall goal – and water quality, as well. The more you disperse and infiltrate, the less chance there is for sediment and other contaminants to be carried into waters of the state.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Just one last thing: I can't remember if I heard you correctly, but in this last example you have a wetland. You say it is undesirable to have the dispersed water reach the wetland?

Mr. Wargo: Typically, yeah. It's not generally considered acceptable to disperse – to discharge stormwater directly into a wetland. In a case like this, it can be dispersed into the wetland buffer as long as it meets the minimum dispersion flow path, but the actual – any infrastructure, any pipes, dispersion trenches, infiltration trenches – basically any stormwater infrastructure needs to be outside of the wetland and its buffer, but the dispersion flow path can be in the buffer but not the wetland or the stream.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Has anybody else – yes?

Commissioner Mark Knutzen: Along with that you were talking about on this picture it says, “No infiltration.” In the wellhead protection zone, you’re not supposed to have *any* infiltration?

Mr. Wargo: As far as – typically no. That’s a specification in the Stormwater Manual.

Commissioner Knutzen: Pollution reasons? You don’t want to get pollution down in the well?

Mr. Wargo: I think that’s the idea, is that – potentially it’s a drinking water protection.

Commissioner Knutzen: It seems like out in the flats you’re bare dirt. How do you *not* have any infiltration? I guess it’s a moot point if you’re not checking.

Mr. Wargo: Yeah. I want to defer – the technical side of that, I would defer to a Public Health specialist on drinking water. My expertise is more with the Stormwater Manual so I’m going off the specifications that are provided for the stormwater in the Stormwater Management Manual for each BMP, and that’s just a – it’s just a restriction provided by the Department of Ecology for the application of these for infiltration techniques.

Commissioner Knutzen: I do have one more question. The goal is to keep all the runoff onsite. I understand that. Out in the lower valley, we have an intricate system of drainage ditches 100-plus years. Typically years ago we would catch the runoff water from the buildings, the barns, downspouts, put all that in a tile, and run that to the ditch off the roofs of the barn. Can’t do that anymore. What’s the reason for that?

Mr. Wargo: That, I mean, the simple answer would be is it’s a – you know, as far as the storm – you know, applying the standards in the Stormwater Manual, the goal is to keep stormwater onsite. So –

Commissioner Knutzen: The goal is to keep it onsite. Is that – am I correct in that?

Mr. Wargo: Yes, that *is* the goal. Yeah. And so it can infiltrate and, you know, there could be multiple reasons behind that. If the runoff is picking up any pollutants, it’s better to have it dispersed over vegetation and soil rather than go directly into a drainage system. So that would be the water quality goal.

Commissioner Knutzen: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead, Martha.

Commissioner Rose: So having put in many of these systems, many of the different kinds of systems and taking all the classes down in Puyallup and stuff, it seems like the emphasis is really on cleaning up the stormwater before it ends up in the wetland or the groundwater. And so even roofing products will – even like metal roofs, for example – leach zinc into the stormwater and the compostable matter, like leaf and stuff like that, will bind up the zinc. For example – I’ve learned this from Ecology. You know, I got to get in on some of their research that they’ve done. And so while it might seem counterintuitive that you’re taking rainwater that’s just running off your roof and you can’t let it go right into the wetlands, it’s all about just cleaning it up first. Right? I mean, isn’t that – that’s my understanding of the whole idea of keeping your water onsite is to make sure



that it's at least partially purified, if not wholly purified, before it starts entering our streams and waterways.

Mr. Wargo: Yes, water quality is an important component, is an important driver.

Commissioner Rose: And flood control too.

Mr. Wargo: Yeah, and also erosion and flood control. It's water quality and quantity both, yes.

Commissioner Rose: Yeah. So I just wanted to throw that out there, that – just sort of reaffirm what you just said – everything, yeah.

Chair Raschko: Any other questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Well, can I come back to that one more time then? It just seems to me like the goal is to disperse water but still have it infiltrate before it gets off your property.

Mr. Wargo: Generally infiltration is top of the list so, yes, getting infiltration is an important goal behind the minimum requirements. Yes.

Chair Raschko: Excuse me – you just don't want surface water running into the next guy.

Mr. Wargo: At an increased rate. You allow what's there but the increased surface water that you're creating from your new surfaces – yeah, you don't want that going down to the next property.

Chair Raschko: No other questions or comments?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, thank you.

Mr. Wargo: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: You didn't have anything, did you, Joe?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: No?

Commissioner Knutzen: Joe's talking but I can't hear him. Looks like he was.

Chair Raschko: Hey Joe, are you muted?

Mr. Gill: No, it looks like he's not muted. Let's see if we can't wire you in here somehow. No, Joe's not muted. Joe does have a comment. Let's see. Joe, can you say hello again and see if we can hear you? I'm getting some thumbs up.

Commissioner Joe Woodmansee: I can hear you.

Mr. Gill: Yes! Well, good! We got you! Thank you.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Can you hear me now?

Chair Raschko: Did you have something, Joe?

Commissioner Vince Henley: There's no image.

Mr. Gill: No, he's talking.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. Okay, yeah. My question is on this 17,000 square foot example. And in that example it appears that it's all the same methods of BMPs. But why does it trigger an engineer if it's all the same methods?

Mr. Gill: That's a good question, Joe. Let's get Andy over here and he can fill us in. So we're looking at the one with the most development on the site.

Mr. Wargo: Yeah, so this would be an example of that threshold. The proposed threshold is 10,000 square feet and that would hit the minimum requirements 1 through 9. That's all the minimum requirements for development per the Stormwater Management Manual. And once you need to meet minimum requirements number 6 and 7 that requires a drainage report and the drainage report needs to be prepared by a licensed engineer. That threshold is double what is in the NPDES area. Inside the permit area, that threshold is 5,000 square feet. So this is intended to provide some flexibility but still some accountability. And I can't speak for, you know, why the threshold was there in the first place, but it's basically a – it provides a higher standard for larger projects to ensure that the stormwater and erosion control are managed accordingly to protect water quality and property values.

Just a little bit of, you know, background against the way the current code is written is for a property like this, under the current code an engineered drainage plan would be required at 20,000 square feet of impervious surface or 1 acre of land disturbance or 500 cubic yards of filler grade.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay, so we're – can you hear me?

Several voices: Yes.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. So we're changing that 20 down to 10, correct?

Mr. Wargo: Yes, and that's – so yeah, so getting back to that balancing out and consistency and clarity between the larger parcels and the smaller parcels. So for parcels under 1 acre that threshold is moving from 4,000 up to 10,000 square feet and for the larger parcels that threshold for all nine minimum requirements would move from down from 20,000 square feet to 10,000 feet. So it'd be a consistent review threshold.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yes. So the reason for the engineering \_\_\_\_\_ (no sound). Basically that's a DOE regulation. Once you hit past 5 you have an engineer.

Mr. Wargo: Yeah, and in the – in the – yeah, it's 5,000 square feet in the NPDES permit area and that is a permit requirement.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Straight out of the DOE manual, I assume?

Mr. Wargo: Yeah, straight out of the manual and the NPDES permit also specifies it.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Right. Correct. Okay. All right, that answers my question.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Joe.

Mr. Gill: Thanks, Andy.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yep.

Chair Raschko: Are there any other questions, comments?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, well, thank you again.

Vice Chair Tammy Candler: I don't know if the – Peter, are you aware that our screens are no longer showing what you're showing on –

Mr. Gill: They're not showing anything. Maybe let me see if I do screen share –

Commissioner Henley: Well, it's colorful anyway!

Mr. Gill: Does that change anything?

Vice Chair Candler: It does.

Mr. Gill: This hybrid meeting idea is still a work in progress a little bit. Those guys have it figured out. We're still trying to figure out how to work all the technology and still be focused on the people in the room. So bear with us a little bit. But you should have now what we're showing. Okay, good.

So with that, I will ask Hal Hart, our director, to come in. You want to just do it from there?

Mr. Hart: Sure, I'll just do it from there and we'll just go quickly, if that works with the Chair. Great.

So updates on growth. And I was just checking. We are getting close to applying for funding for our Comprehensive Plan update. That money has been given to the County via the Commerce Department, so we have to apply for the funding, show that work, and this is the year that we'll start doing that so I'll start mentioning that here and there and peppering any remarks, thinking, Hey, big picture: What happened over the last 20 years here? And I just did a quick look, and my kids are in high school now so we've added about 20,000 people, roughly, to the county population during the time they were born in the 2000s to the time they're in high school now. Just another way to – you know, What have we been doing? We've been adding people around the county. We've been dispersing them around in the county, but we have a lot of growth coming and where's it coming from? And Peter, I'm sure, is very tired of me talking about this all the time, like every chance I get.

So, you know, Seattle is the – kind of has been number two nationally for the last many years in crane count. Or it's been number one in the US but number two in North America. Number one is

always Toronto, just FYI. I always wonder why that is, but that's – they are just exponentially greater in cranes and growth than anybody – anyone in North America in the other country – or, excuse me, *city* in North America. LA has just pushed beyond Seattle. And I think for me, because I drive a lot around the area, I think it's Bellevue is really blossoming in a very huge effort, and today they just announced another life sciences center that will be – it'll have about the same square footage as everything in Bothell, which is a life sciences center. It's international in scope and it's growing. It's spreading out to other locations and pushing other companies out of the way too, because those guys can afford the real estate and that moves other companies and groups further out.

So what do we see, you know, coming north? Consistently in terms of types of growth that we're seeing move north, residential home development. We're seeing a lot of that going north. If you were to drive to Everett today, probably five really significant projects going in residential growth in Everett. Marysville, very similar growth. Next one, Arlington – a lot of growth coming there. But they're also seeing other industrial, aerospace – other firms out in that area. When we were asking people today that want jobs here, Where do you live and where are you coming from? And a lot of them live here and they're tired of the commute south. And I said, Well, how long have you been doing that commute? Twenty years. That's a long time. Today I was watching a 20-mile backup. Twenty-mile backup on that coming north. And so people are tired of that. The roads are constrained. As we grow, as we add hundreds of thousands of people to the north of Seattle, it's going to make individual decisions where people will want to live here. And they will look for ways to live here, move their businesses here, and those kinds of things. So when I look at that, I look at Stanwood – the next one I look at. Close to our border. It's sold out – Their latest subdivision. They've got two more building. You can look at Skagit Bay from there. And those houses are in the 4 to 500,000 range and the same developer that was developing here in Mount Vernon is developing there.

And so it's a – just kind of giving you the lay of the land of what I see. Cities is the focus. Eighty percent of the growth to go to cities and more or less is the objective. So Burlington's doing an outstanding job right now capturing a lot of that future growth. Sedro-Woolley has got both housing, affordable housing, and doing a tremendous job in multifamily and just capturing all the different types of housing. You'll see more around Mount Vernon in the future, so they're capturing it. There are many efforts ongoing right now looking at housing and how to capture the affordable housing to, you know, all levels. Do we have enough land set aside is a primary county thing that we're asking about, and we'll continue to look at that and evaluate that as we move forward in the next year of looking. Working with the cities, we'll be looking at the demographic analysis. So be, you know, I'm just like the icing that you'll hear, but you'll get more of that as we move forward in the next year from the SCOG – the cities and counties working together.

So the main thing I want to show – just go to the next slide. This is some of those LGI homes that sold out. That's all sold. Even though it's not done, it is sold out. And then also Stanwood. There's some affordable housing there. There's other apartment complexes going in with some well-known, national engineering firms working on those. And I just kind of wanted to bring you some of that information this evening.

Locally, the last thing I'll say is, Okay, what's going on right now? I just toured – went out to just take a look, and these are some of the biggies that are out there right now. We have a couple of hangars that you'll see coming to the airport. Each one of those will be 26,000 square feet and each one will have two bays. And so there's actually places for four different aviation – general aviation folks to be there. And then you'll see one more very large commercial aviation hangar coming in as well. And so I was out there today and they have the heavy equipment with the

checked flags on it and that's where it's going to go. It's sitting just where they're going to go, and those are going to be reviewed by our team right now – Andy's team – right now in the building and planning office.

But also on our list, we have Amazon finishing out. We have Sakata Seed continuing to move forward. These are all creating jobs. And we have the rendering plant – you know, the small one – which we recently had an – we have an opportunity for a 6 or 7,000 square foot expansion now, so we expect that one to increase by 6 or 7,000 feet. And that's good because it's taking care of a local need, a local need for farmers to – you know, for meat production. And it's been missing in our local area. Heritage Flight Museum is beautiful. They have a great U.S. Airforce display right in front now and I can't wait to take my kids there. They're putting in a lot of new utilities up there. We have continued expansions of Westland Whiskey. That is a long-term so you keep looking for those barrel houses. They're going to have a lot of those barrel houses out there over time. And Camp Korey. We always forget about Camp Korey. It's to the south of us. But they have a major expansion. They've created a village out there for the campers and they've received a lot of funding from all over the state, and they are going to have a – I think, an open house coming up. And the last thing that they're doing in this phase is a big water tower for fire safety. So that water tower's almost done and so I can – if anybody's interested, I can ask Jack when that is. They've asked me if I wanted to go. But it's, you know, a camp with a good cause behind it. They will have future expansions as well.

We still have two companies this week that are searching the area for other – they provide you a sheet of what they look for – how many acres, proximity to freeway – and I usually say, Go look in the city. There might be open land in the city of Burlington or somewhere else that's zoned industrial. But we do have some land out at the airport for that as well. So I'm just kind of giving you the daily rap sheet. What that does is that is – hopefully I'm implementing the Comprehensive Plan the way that has been envisioned, where people have the right to develop on the property but it's consistent with the zoning that's there. And that's the blueprint we're following is the Comp Plan and the zoning is the rules. And we have a chance to take another look at that and say, What are we doing in the next 20 years? And that will start this year. So just a heads up. Sorry I went so long, Tim, but I'm giving you the overview.

Chair Raschko: Any questions?

Mr. Gill: Did you want to talk about the legislative stuff?

Mr. Hart: Oh. Yeah, we – one more thing. Legislatively we've done a lot of legislative changes – breathtaking amount of legislative changes for a short session. I've talked a little bit about it before. I won't go into it deeply tonight. I want to get more information from the Department of Commerce. They have set up a number of – Department of Fish and Wildlife and others are doing it as well – but the departments at this point have been told to go do various studies and analyses and report back to the legislature. They'll do that. One of them is Growth Management work is still being reported back to the legislature, and the other part of that is this year we're going to be looking at, How do you reach those parts of your community that may not have been fully reached out to in the past? And so that's kind of the equity issue and just making sure that when we do comprehensive planning we're really talking to the full community. So there's new guidance that's going to come out on that.

Climate resiliency has also continued to be an issue, and it's working its way through probably a number of different efforts at the state level. We may see comments coming back to the County on that saying, Hey, the Shoreline Master Program: We should be looking at that as well again.

But the main look – even though we’re evaluating now we would do that again in, I think it’s ’28. Is that right, Peter? The next time we go back to the Shoreline Master Program I think is in 2028.

Mr. Gill: Eight years. Eight years.

Mr. Hart: So we’ll do what we can now, but I think that’s going to be an issue that will continue to make itself known through the comprehensive planning process. And primarily, I think, sea level rise on the one hand and then maybe increased fire issues in the eastern county. The counties around us are doing analyses about climate change and so it’s kind of interesting to see Chelan County is all about fire response and, Hey, we’re putting people in areas that are going to burn more often into the future, so how do we respond to that? So I’ll be reading their stuff for sure.

Chair Raschko: Any questions for Mr. Hart?

Mr. Gill: I do have a couple of updates.

Chair Raschko: Right. I just have a comment, though.

Mr. Hart: You bet.

Chair Raschko: I appreciate the concern that you appear to have about the growth that’s coming. I picture it as a tidal wave that’s going to just – and last week I had to kill some time in Stanwood and I drove up on the hill. I was shocked. I mean, it was just unbelievable. I didn’t know that all those neighborhoods had gone in up there. And, you know, we love this county for its openness and, you know, the tulips and the agriculture and everything, and you just wonder if it can survive. I mean, it’s one thing for farmland to survive but it’s another thing for agriculture to survive when it’s got this huge influx of people and different values and things. So I commend you for your sense – or the alarm that I sense you have in wanting to stay in front of this. So thank you.

Commissioner Knutzen: Can I have a question too?

Chair Raschko: You may.

Commissioner Knutzen: Right along with what you said, the developments that you talked about are in urban areas or in the city limits or they’re in housing, and it’s covered – all the lots are covered, as opposed to you go out – and that’s the zoning for houses – when you go out in Rural Reserve, it’s a 5-acre, but it’s cluster housing. So I used to live at Bay Meadows. There were 28 1-acre lots there. It was originally a 140-acre farm up on the hill. It’s not down in the flats. Rural Reserve. And there’s 31 acres covered with houses and roads and there’s about 105 acres of open space that’s just cattle. They make hay. And also up there too there’s Apex Farms is working on one just down the road that’s 33. It’s 167 acres. There’s only going to be 33 houses on that. They’re cluster housing. And I understand up there there’s no sewer, there’s – there is public water, but there’s no infrastructure to serve the whole thing. And that’s all the houses that they can build there.

But I look at that – cattle farmers would disagree with this, but that’s a waste of ground, in my opinion. There’s 105 acres there that could be covered with houses. Now I know my neighbors would shoot me if they heard me say that, but – and I know the zoning would have to change and this is long term, but what’s the feasibility of some day you need to bring sewer in and water in and you need to convince the neighbors that you’re going to have a hundred acres of houses next to them. Is that feasible down the road?

Mr. Hart: Well, it's as much a political question as anything else first.

Commissioner Knutzen: There's hundreds of thousands of acres up there!

Mr. Hart: Right. We just went through a very large process of potentially looking at a standalone community someplace. And the community, we heard loud and clear, was very much opposed to that future in the county. But theoretically we can certainly show you different approaches to land use that would be – and it's been tried in many other locations around the country. There's a Connecticut River Valley Study that was *really* instrumental back in the '90s in guiding Growth Management counties and states, and they looked – I think it was MIT or somebody – they looked at: Can you grow, can you put people on the landscape but maintain rural, maintain agriculture, and not know the people are there? How do you do that? And, you know, the east coast is quite a bit more dense with folks than we are, although maybe now, 25 years later, we're catching up, right? But we used to have – early in Growth Management, we used to have I think he was known as the Galloping Gourmet guy for Haggen. But he was a big believer – I don't know if you remember him too – he was a great believer in the green heart. And the green heart concept was – he was taking it from the Netherlands. They had 13 million people on an area about the size of western Washington, and he said, They've managed to save agriculture. You know, they've kept the economics there, and then they have a lot of people close by. And those were different approaches, kind of big picture approaches, and they always said that Skagit County *has* to maintain its ag economy. And that will also help the Stilly – the valley over in the Stilly, and that helps Whatcom County as well if we are working together to maintain agriculture, because what is happening all around us is a greater density. So greater density to Everett and now – I think the last 10 or 15 years – up to Marysville, all the way up to Arlington. Stanwood's kind of an outlier still. And then to the north, you know, the fight is on to preserve it in Canada. And the lower mainland there's hardly – you know, it's pretty floodable ground there but there's still battles being fought there. Sure.

Commissioner Knutzen: Twenty-five or 30 years ago there was a county or there was a proposal. I think the County spent a couple of million dollars on a study. Peterson Road, north of Peterson Road up by the airport, Bouslog property, 800 houses. A school was going to be up there. That's the – the fire hall that's up there, Bay Hill, that was built there to serve the houses that were going to be built there. And there was – I know the drainage district down below – you know, agriculture, and I've been in agriculture my whole life – was concerned about runoff. They mitigated that. And then at the last minute it got changed to Light Industry. Is it feasible that that could ever switch back into houses, or is this – am I getting in a little too deep on all this?

Mr. Hart: No sir, Commissioner. These are all important questions that we need to ask ourselves at the comprehensive plan level, and ask the feasibility of that again. And we may get to the same answers. The community may still say, Nope, we would like to keep this green, and by that we have – here are the rules we want to move forward. That has gone back and forth. When I first got here I heard those stories, and we're going to get a chance to go back and create a – I would say a subarea history that – What happened to the zoning and when did it happen? What are the rules for development today and when did those happen? And how are they – and the most important thing is, How are the rules working for us? That's really important. And so are the rules doing what we said? Are the rules protecting agriculture and preserving the rural environment or do we need to tweak that? Are they allowing for housing or not? And, you know, and you look at the cost of housing as part of that analysis as well.

Commissioner Knutzen: What's the driver on this? Is it the property owner? Is it the government? Is it the County Commissioners? Is it the Planning?

Mr. Hart: That's a great question, a beautiful question. The framework was given to us in 1990, 91, and then it's been – all through the '90s and even today it's been changed – again this year. That framework is being worked over based on needs again and again. And so it seems like the significant need here in this valley is to balance agricultural needs, population needs, and salmon recovery needs, and that has a statewide interest, and much more than I think it did in 1990 when I was a planning director in eastern Washington watching this. That was still important but it's even heightened. And we've added so much more population to the Puget Sound region in that timeframe. So the work being done in stormwater tonight is a reflection of hundreds of – you know, thousands of new homes and trying to curb a long-term trend with smart strategies one at a time, because the water quality of Puget Sound has been heightened every decade since I've – you know, it was always a concern but it's a really significant concern now that we have a million or two million more people in the state.

Commissioner Knutzen: We farm right below the hill on Peterson Road. We were not looking forward to 800 houses being a half a mile up the road. But I wasn't opposed to it. Well, initially I was.

Commissioner Rose: So I want to – I've heard talk of with today's industry – like on industrial land – it's not the same as industry a decade or two or five decades ago. It's much cleaner, and that there's no reason to disallow housing intermingled with the industry anymore. It's real clear why that separation took place for so many decades. So it seems like having housing on the industrial land like apartments and stuff would reduce commute times for all those people that work there. So those are the kinds of things I hope we're going to look at. You know what I'm saying?

Mr. Hart: Yeah.

Commissioner Rose: Like more than fully contained communities. That makes way more sense to me than a fully contained community. Also densifying the urban areas more than they are.

Mr. Hart: Right.

Commissioner Rose: There's so much potential there.

Mr. Hart: I will just only say – Tim, I apologize – I would only say that that is absolutely right on the money. We're seeing the cities to the south of us put housing – I've scratched my head a few times but it's actually – I get it. Because the life science area, which was all dairy farms 30 years ago in the Bothell area, is – maybe 40 years ago now – but originally it was platted out in the '80s and we were thinking old style industry, but it's actually life sciences. So yes, I don't know if I would – that doesn't make sense – I'm not sure if I want a whatever they're cooking in their life sciences laboratory to get out, but assuming that it doesn't they are putting a lot of residential housing across the street from industry now and they've interspersed. So the open ones – so I'm – I think it's a really important strategy to consider so I'm glad that you're up on that.

Commissioner Rose: Mm-hmm, yep. All right. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Anybody else?



Commissioner Henley: Yes. We've danced around the subject a little bit, but you mentioned fully contained communities. There's a study that was supposed to be jacked up on that and then it was withdrawn or cancelled. Now my question is, since it happens to be the elephant in the room: Is the proposal for a fully contained community study, is that truly dead or is that just going to resurface again in six months or two years or five years?

Mr. Hart: I'll let Peter take a shot at that. Peter, where do you think that exists now and what is the mission this year?

Mr. Gill: Well, so to answer the question, it is not completely dead. The Board of Commissioners did pass a resolution that would defer it to SCOG, which is the Skagit Council of Governments, to evaluate through the Comprehensive Plan periodic update, which begins this summer. And part of the process there is to look at the existing open space that exists in Urban Growth Areas for future development. And so they'll be looking at what our anticipated growth is over the next 20 years and do we have enough room within the existing Urban Growth Areas to accommodate that growth. And if we don't, then what is the options, and that's where that conversation about the fully contained communities would come in.

Commissioner Henley: But I understand that we're going to be working on the Comp Plan a little bit later this year, all right? And are you – did I just hear you say that, basically, mention of FCCs is going to be part of that Comp Plan revisions?

Mr. Gill: So, in a long kind of way. It won't be this year though, to be clear. Our Comp Plan review doesn't start until next year at least, and part of the, you know, growth planning really belongs at the Skagit Council of Governments level, and that's where the allocation between future growth happens. Which city gets how much growth in the future? How much happens in the unincorporated areas? How much happens in Mount Vernon? How much happens in Anacortes? All those decisions are made there and that's kind of that process.

The second part of the answer to that question is that there is a new proposal to do a fully contained community for the 2022 docket, and so –

Commissioner Henley: So it's like the Avalon project rebirthed or something like that?

Mr. Gill: It just keeps cycling because there has not been any kind of decision on it. And so Jenn will give you a lot more information on that in the future as we go. But, yeah.

Commissioner Henley: Thank you.

Mr. Gill: Yeah. Good.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Peter, you have –

Mr. Gill: Yeah, so I don't have as good a big picture, exciting things to talk about. That was a really good discussion that wrapped in protection of ag and stormwater and concentrated growth. But I do want to come back to what we've been working on for the last six months or so, which was the 2021 docket. Yesterday the Board of County Commissioners adopted the 2021 docket, and so what you see on your screen here is what they approved. In the first –

Commissioner Henley: Blank screen.

Mr. Gill: Okay. Let's see. I'm screen sharing. It *should* be sharing. No? Let me stop and try it again.

Commissioner Knutzen: There it's back.

Mr. Gill: All right, I'm not going to touch it. So the first five there on your screen, the four citizen petitions and the four County petitions that were considered, were approved consistent with the recorded motion. So Hal talked about an ag processing facility in Bayview Ridge so the Island Grown Food Co-Op is proceeding. That change made happened. Nielsen Brothers map amendment happened. Accessory dwelling units, that was passed consistent with your proposal, which is the 1200 square feet and no –

Commissioner Henley: I thought that was – the 1200 square feet was approved?

Mr. Gill: It was, yes.

Commissioner Henley: Okay, good.

Mr. Gill: Front setbacks in Bayview Ridge, Bayview Ridge Residential, are now all 20 feet all the way across the board, and some of the other things you see up there. So that is circling back to let you know. They also did approve the public notice for mineral resource extraction activities is 1300 square feet, so they expanded that public notice to 1300 square feet for mineral resource extraction activities. And then they denied those two last petitions which were on the CaRD function, the Conservation and Reserve Development land division. So they did not approve that and the SEPA petition was also denied, so consistent with your recommendations.

Anyway, I thought that would bring that back around and let you know where that is.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you.

Mr. Gill: Last thing: Stormwater Code Update public meetings are happening Thursday at 6 o'clock and Friday morning at 8:30. And if people are watching online, the website, if you Google stormwater updates 2022 Skagit County, you can get more information on how to join those meetings.

And lastly I wanted to talk about a little bit of transition. I am moving on. This is my last Planning Commission meeting. And so I wanted to say thank you for all your patience for the last 2½ years. We have been through a lot from the 2019 docket to the Shoreline Master Program to the flood code that was eight years in the making. 2021 docket. And you all have worked diligently to help us through that, so I appreciate all your help with that. And we do have a great transition plan with Hal and Jenn kind of keeping the ship moving until my replacement comes in. And with Andy and Shawn's help, the Stormwater program will keep moving along, and Jason is always there in the background helping us out where we need some legal help. So we've got a good plan for things to keep forward – keep moving forward.

So Stormwater: On your screen you'll see the Stormwater program is at the top there going through the first meeting in June with a hearing in the second meeting in May. And that's what the x's are on this little chart. The Planning Docket that will be coming kind of right as Stormwater is wrapping up hopefully that Jenn will be bringing forward as it goes through the Board, shooting for a hearing in the second meeting in July. Basically what we've kind of set up is two or three work sessions and then a public hearing and then more time for deliberation after the public

hearing. It seems like that has worked best for how you all operate and so I'm encouraging folks to start moving that way.

Agritourism is a bigger fish a little bit and there is a ton of public interest, and so we have scheduled a little more time to work on that, and the first meeting on that will be next meeting, which is the – let's see, May 10<sup>th</sup>. We'll talk Stormwater a little bit but we also talk about Agritourism and where we're at with that. We've been working hard on that in the background.

And then Capital Facilities Update is an annual thing that will be coming back, and then Wireless Facilities is the other thing that we hope to get through this year.

So that's our plan. I'm sticking to it as long as I'm here. And anyway, I thank you all and I appreciate all your volunteer time. It's a *big* commitment.

Chair Raschko: Well, go ahead, please.

Vice Chair Candler: On this, the purple line for Agritourism looks like it's scheduled to be the same day as the public hearing for Stormwater. Is that supposed to be the meeting prior or is that going to be the same night as the hearing?

Mr. Gill: I think it's set up so that it's the same night as the hearing because often those hearings are fairly short and it seems like a kind of waste, but that you could make more of those meetings if the hearing is only 20 minutes or a half-an-hour. So we've kind of set it up so that we have both of those things.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you.

Mr. Gill: And if you don't get to the second one, it's just a work session. That's understandable.

Chair Raschko: Yeah, are there any other questions about the transition?

Commissioner Henley: Yes, I have one.

Chair Raschko: Okay, we'll start here and work our way down.

Commissioner Knutzen: The Board of County Commissioners yesterday approved the docket. Are those code amendments effective now?

Mr. Gill: They are effective immediately – after signing, I should say.

Commissioner Knutzen: Okay, good. Thank you.

Commissioner Henley: A question about Agritourism. I seem to remember hearing a fair amount of dissent and opposition from agricultural interests in the valley about agritourism. Is that one of the things that they're working on? I mean, it wasn't all sweetness and light, as I understand it.

Mr. Gill: Nope. No, it isn't. There's a lot of parts to it so depending on who you ask and where you ask it you'll get different answers.

Commissioner Henley: Okay.

Mr. Gill: Yep. I'll bring all that to you. We've been talking to the community, we've been – we've got surveys out, we've got a new concepts report that we can talk about, and the preferred alternative that will be presented to you all.

Commissioner Henley: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Was it Jen? Or Amy, were you wanting to speak?

Commissioner Amy Hughes: If we're done in Commissioner Comments, but if we're just talking about his presentation –

Chair Raschko: Well, we're just going to finish this. I thought either of you – I mean, there was a lot of people all of a sudden wanting to talk and once I think I missed somebody. No?

Commissioner Hughes: Okay.

Chair Raschko: No? Okay. Was that the end of the report?

Mr. Gill: That was it. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Well, thank you. We will turn to Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements, and if nobody minds I'd like to go first and just make a comment that I really appreciate the job that Peter's done. And I'm one of these wary people who gets hard to get to know him. People tell me I'm grouchy. And so, you know, you kind of watch when somebody new comes and kind of get a feel for how they're going to be, and I have to say, Peter, that I really came to appreciate you a lot. I mean, when people requested things or needed help on stuff, you provided it. You wanted to be helpful to us instead of get in our way, and that is just so nice and appreciated. And I really wish you luck in your endeavors and all the blessings and happiness that life can provide.

Mr. Gill: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Mr. Raschko: So with that we'll move to – we'll start with Mark. Have you anything?

Commissioner Knutzen: Yes, I just have a comment. I am really happy we're meeting in person and not having to wear masks. So thank you for allowing us to do this. I hope we can continue for the foreseeable future meeting like this.

Mr. Gill: Yeah.

Commissioner Knutzen: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Martha?

Commissioner Rose: Tim did a good job describing how it has been to work with you, and I just want to ditto all that because, yeah, it's been great. And, yeah, best wishes with wherever you're going or whatever you're going to do. I hope it all works out great.

Mr. Gill: Yeah, thank you. Thank you.

Vice Chair Candler: Peter, I'm sorry to see you go but I wish you absolutely the best in your new adventure, new endeavors. I want to echo what people are saying. Just your even keel, for lack of a better descriptor, has been really appreciated and your work that you've done. Thank you. And I want to go on record saying that I don't think that our Chairman is grouchy.

Chair Raschko: Well, thank you! Vince?

Commissioner Henley: Yes. Peter, I'd like to say that over the time that I've been here I've come to appreciate your dedication and professionalism. It's been a pleasure working with you.

Mr. Gill: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Amy?

Commissioner Hughes: I just have to say I agree with everything said. When you first introduced yourself to us you were very conscientious of, I'm coming in to something you're used to; how can I help? You asked us what do we need and you listened, and it's been a joy working with you. Best of luck for your future. Hope to see you on the street sometime.

Mr. Gill: Yep, I'm not going far.

Commissioner Hughes: Okay.

Mr. Gill: Thanks.

Chair Raschko: So, Jen, how do you find working with Peter?

(laughter)

Commissioner Jenny Hutchison: \_\_\_\_\_ that you're going so soon. I just got here! You've actually been so inspirational when I watched and followed these guys on the Internet for so long. And just your leadership and guidance to this Commission is impressive, and so happy sails.

Chair Raschko: And Joe, do you have anything nice to say?

(laughter)

Chair Raschko: Can't hear you!

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Well, thumbs up. We get a thumbs up from Joe.

Mr. Gill: That's good. That's great! Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, is there anything else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: If not, we'll stand adjourned. Thank you, everybody. Have a good night. (gavel)