

Skagit County Planning Commission
Presentation: 2022 Docket
Preview: 2023 Docket
Work Session: Wireless Facilities Code Update
August 9, 2022

Planning

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

Staff: Hal Hart, Planning Director
Sarah Ruether, Long Range Planning Manager
Jenn Rogers, Assistant Long Range Planner

Others: John Ravnik, Engineer for Applicant Steve Bertelsen
Steve Bertelsen, Applicant
Ali Bertelsen, Applicant

Public Remarks

Commenters: Ken Dahlstedt

Chair Tim Raschko: (gavel) Good evening. The August 9, 2022, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission is now in session. Let's see, a role call – I believe everybody is present except for Commissioner Rose.

Several Commissioners: Knutzen.

Chair Raschko: And who?

Vice Chair Tammy Candler: Knutzen.

Chair Raschko: And Commissioner Knutzen. Thank you. Okay, if you can please note that for the record. I'd entertain a motion for the approval of the minutes from our last meeting.

Commissioner Vince Henley: I move that we approve the minutes from the last meeting.

Commissioner Kathy Mitchell: Second.

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes. Is there any discussion of the minutes?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, hearing none, all those in favor, say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: All opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Thank you. That carries. So we will go now to Public Remarks. Is there anybody in the audience who wishes to address the Commission, please go ahead. Mr. Dahlstedt?

Ken Dahlstedt: Well, first of all this is the first time I've actually been in front of the Planning Commission, and I just want to say thank you. I think that a lot of people in the public don't realize you're all volunteers. You put in all the time that you do for the benefit of the community without any remuneration, so the flak you get and occasionally the rare compliment. So I just want to thank you for all the work you do and wish you well. And it's always a tough job because no matter what you do some people are going to like it and some people aren't and you've just got to do it the best you can. So thank you.

Chair Raschko: Well, thank you. That was well received. Are there any others who wish – please go ahead. Please state your name and address.

John Ravnik: My name is John Ravnik. Just a clarification: Were you asking for general comments not relative to the subject tonight?

Chair Raschko: That's correct.

Mr. Ravnik: Okay. I just want to make sure. Thank you, sir.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Jenn, do you know of anybody online?

Sarah Ruether: No, no one's online.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you, Sarah. Well, with that then, we will move to our first main topic tonight, which is the Presentation on the 2022 Docket.

Ms. Ruether: John?

Mr. Ravnik: Yes?

Mr. Ravnik: You want me to start?

Ms. Ruether: Yeah, go ahead.

Mr. Ravnik: Good evening. My name is John Ravnik. The last name is spelled r-a-v – as in Victor – n-i-k. I reside with Post Office Box 361, Burlington, Washington. I'm the principle engineer with a company called Ravnik & Associates. I've been working with the Bertelsens and staff through this Comprehensive Plan amendment process. Shall I wait?

Chair Raschko: No, please continue.

Mr. Ravnik: Thank you, sir. And the first work session that you had brought up a couple of comments, some from the members here tonight and also some general public comments. And the goal here is for me to clarify or correct even, some of the matters that were at-hand. There was a question about: Why not just stay with Rural Reserve? Why go to Small Scale Recreation and Tourism? And if you go through the Rural Reserve zoning code there's three things that I looked at. I looked at the word "commercial," I looked at the word "retail," and I looked at the word "business." Well, in the Rural Reserve the word "commercial" is in there but it has to do with having a drop box at a commercial business. So in that instance the subject is "drop box." It's not "commercial." So the Rural Reserve zoning code does not allow for or promote commercial development

In a review of the word "retail," the word "retail" is not even in the Rural Reserve zoning code. And the only potential business opportunities would be a Home – it's called a Home-Based Business 1, 2, or 3 – and neither of those levels of home-based business even get close to addressing what the agritourism proposal that you have with the Bertelsen Winery.

So from that perspective to try to even proceed with this Comprehensive Plan amendment and say, "Well, we'll stay Rural Reserve," it's not going to get us there.

Within the zoning code for the Small Scale Recreation and Tourism, it speaks about having commercial facilities such as restaurants, small retail service businesses, but the caveat is if they serve the primary recreational or tourist use. So you have to have that recreational or tourist use *first of all* to even support having any type of a commercial retail restaurant – things of that nature. We do have that with the Bertelsen Winery. Step 1 has been accomplished.

Skagit County's Comprehensive Plan goes in and speaks about avoiding the proliferation of businesses in unincorporated Skagit County. Rural sprawl would be another term you could use, or business sprawl. The winery's already there. It's already been well-established. It's already well-known. They've already got plans for a permitted brewery for tenant improvements across the street. They are already vested. So from this perspective I think it's not only a desire. I think it's mandatory that the Small Scale Recreation and Tourism be applied to the title of moving it forward so that their proposal, their agritourism can actually become something.

There was also a concern expressed – I think this was most of a public comment – about this project being too close to natural resource lands. In information that I've previously provided to you – and I went into a little bit more detail in the documents you were hopefully recently provided – the nearest natural resource land is a mile away. And there are others but they're 1.3, 1.5 miles. Probably one of the most disruptive uses – and you get a lot of squawk from the community – is when you have gravel pits or mineral resource areas where they do mining or blasting or whatever the case may be. In the information that I shared with you, it speaks to the separation distances outside of or beyond Mineral Resource Overlays – 200 feet, 500 feet, a quarter of a mile. If those are the only regulations that Skagit County requires for the proximity of Mineral Resource Overlay, we're a mile away. We're four times the biggest distance that a Mineral Resource Overlay would say we have to have. So we're not going to have a negative influence on any activities that might be associated with the natural resource land.

There was a reference – and Jenn, I'm not picking on you – you used the word, or maybe it was public comment, about the project was "near" natural resource lands, and that's just the wrong context. You know, the fact is we're a mile away if not more.

There was also a concern that this project or these activities were going to be reducing farming activities. So in the information that was provided to you I've clarified what the Soil Conservation Service identifies the existing soils as being, and they're a very, very rocky, hard soil. And I've given you aerial photographs that go from 2021 at alternate stages back to 1937. And outside of one patch which, according to Mr. Bertelsen, was his brother's attempt at growing hay, you don't see farming activities in that area of this project. They just do not exist. You have tough soils to work with, you do not have any irrigation waters available. So it hampers, you know, any agricultural activities that could be possible. So we can't reduce or create an impact on farming if the farming is not presently there.

Skagit County's Comprehensive Plan goes in and speaks about small scale recreational or tourist uses may include cabins, cottages, recreational vehicle parks, outdoor recreational equipment, cultural/religious retreats at accessory uses such as restaurants and small retail shops. The preparation of food is an accessory use. It's also a requirement by law, is that, surprisingly, the Washington State Liquor Control Board does not have a menu requirement for the tasting of wine. Mr. Bertelsen found that not all couples enjoy having wine and so we thought, Well, you know what? I think I'll bring two beers on. And he brought two beers on. The Washington State Liquor Control Board stepped in and said the menu that you have with the wine is great – a little limited. You need to enhance that if you're going to sell beer. So they understand by law that they have to have some food distribution just for their beer and their wine, and having food with wine is just always a good idea.

There was some concern that this project is going to diminish the water level in the aquifer. Well, everything is onboard at the Bertelsen Winery. The winery already functions with a state-approved Class A water system. There is a well that has been approved by the Department of Ecology on the north side of Starbird Road, which facilitates water for the development of the brewery that they have going on. The nearest water line that PUD owns is a mile-and-a-half to two miles to the north. And there has been some comments made – Well, PUD'll never get there. Well, in the documents that I provided to you – and I could either put them up with the screen or you can look at them at your leisure – we've got a map of what PUD's existing network is and we also have a map to illustrate PUD's long-term proposal for expansion. And so you have a map that just got (has) blue lines on it, which represents the existing water line network owned and operated by PUD, and you also have another map that has a series of red lines on it, and that represents the future or proposed water lines for PUD. The PUD system plans on scooting right down Starbird Road right in front of this project. So that adds a lot of flexibility, not only to the business. It gives people an opportunity if there is any residential development. I know there has been concerns over the years of, you know, I would love to have my Rural Reserve 10 acres and put my house on it, but I can't because I can't get a well. So the water is not only a necessity for the *future* expansion or growth of this business. It's just a very valuable community amenity to the properties out there.

So I hope that you've taken the time to go through (and) read some of this clarifying information. I will do my very best to answer any questions that you may have. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Are there questions? Please go ahead, Mark.

Commissioner Mark Knutzen: Easy quick one: NRL, Natural Resource Lands –

Mr. Ravnik: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Knutzen: When I first read that, John, I'm thinking farm ground – that's natural resource land. But how many things are there in the code? This many. _____. National (sic) Resource Lands. I thought it would be the farm ground down below. But so I don't know if you would answer, or you guys might answer: The zoning on the farm ground is NRL but it's something else for –

Mr. Ravnik: It's Agricultural-dash-NRL.

Commissioner Knutzen: Ag-NRL? All right, there you go.

Mr. Ravnik: And you've got SF, which is Secondary Forest.

Commissioner Knutzen: Right. Okay.

Mr. Ravnik: So yeah, the NRL is a basket of a variety of uses.

Commissioner Knutzen: Right. Okay. I do have another one.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Commissioner Knutzen: You reference the soil survey map from Department of Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. Ravnik: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Knutzen: Was that, like, a white covered map, booklet like this? Not like this. This is 1951, okay?

Mr. Ravnik: Well, but, you know what? I do believe the Soil Conservation Service of Skagit County has an update publication that's still similar to this.

Commissioner Knutzen: And the updated one – because I have one of those. I couldn't find it because I never use it. And that – I'm questioning the soil types that you reference in your document.

Mr. Ravnik: Okay, and if you'll bear with me, I have in my information here already printed out the information from those specific pages so I can tell you exactly or I can share it with you.

Commissioner Knutzen: No, I have all that, John.

Mr. Ravnik: Okay.

Commissioner Knutzen: But it doesn't match what I have in here, which should not surprise me. I have the new map but the new map, I'm saying, is 1985 and it's the same – I want to make sure I know – to me, it's hill ground. I've farmed here my whole life.

Mr. Ravnik: Right.

Commissioner Knutzen: ___ ground if Fir Island up where we're at. That's bottom ground. That's hill ground. And the reason I went to this is this is all color-coded. You open a map – I've got your Bertelsen Nursery – and you open a map, and you see the pink?

Mr. Ravnik: Kind of an orangish-pink? Yeah.

Commissioner Knutzen: Pink is Fir Island. The blue and the purple is Starbird Road, the hill.

Mr. Ravnik: Sure.

Commissioner Knutzen: Bingo! You guys _____ can see from there the hill ground.

Mr. Ravnik: Right.

Commissioner Knutzen: The new maps don't have that. But the problem I have, the hill ground here, there is no Starbird exit. There is no I-5 on this map. Old 99 is there. I follow it up the Old Conway Hill –

Mr. Ravnik: Yep.

Commissioner Knutzen: And the soils type there are Bow Hill gravel and loam, I think it's called.

Mr. Ravnik: Yes.

Commissioner Knutzen: Well, that's not Bow Hill.

(laughter)

Commissioner Knutzen: And I'm trying to associate this book with your terminology and it was – I got the word too, but I forgot what it was.

Mr. Ravnik: Here is the title of the document that I have, is Custom Soil Resource Report for Skagit County, and it's issued by the United States Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Commissioner Knutzen: What year? Does it say? Probably not.

Chair Raschko: Can I offer a clarification? When it comes to these things, when a soil or rock formation – that type – is first identified, then similar ones in the vicinity get the same name. Okay? So the Bow Hill sandy loam, or whatever it might be, could exist on Conway Hill if it's a very similar soil.

Commissioner Knutzen: To me it's all the same.

Chair Raschko: So it's not necessarily an error.

Mr. Ravnik: No, no.

Commissioner Knutzen: To me – it's hill ground to me. But as I know hill growing up in the north. I just want to make sure for clarification for *my* knowledge that that's the same kind of ground down there similar to what we're talking about.

Mr. Ravnik: Yeah. Yeah. It's a very rocky, silty clay, and the best you can get out of it, I understand, is hay and that's limited production. And in the description of the soils, it even identifies limited production for any type of an agricultural product.

Commissioner Knutzen: It's called "poorly drained soil underlain by glacial drip."

Mr. Ravnik: Pretty close right there.

Commissioner Knutzen: Fir Island is poorly drained soil. Fir Island's poorly drained underlying by alluvial materials.

Mr. Ravnik: Which would be more conducive of what would be transported in ____ floodplain. Yes.

Commissioner Knutzen: That's the farm ground, and this ground that we're talking about here is *not* what I call farm ground. Okay, thank you.

Mr. Ravnik: No, you are correct and it's substantiated by the fact that clear back to 1937 there's no real evidence that there is a prolific agricultural use in the area. Not just on the property.

Commissioner Knutzen: There wasn't in 1951.

Mr. Ravnik: There you go.

Commissioner Knutzen: They say it in here.

Mr. Ravnik: Okay.

Commissioner Knutzen: We had 18000 acres of __ trees then. Sorry! Totally different subject! I'm done.

Mr. Ravnik: Okay. Thank you, sir.

Chair Raschko: Are there any other questions for Mr. Ravnik?

Commissioner Knutzen: No.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Joe Woodmansee: John, were you going to talk about the project at all tonight, or are you just responding to some comments that came out? I *wish* this was going to be a time to talk about the project also.

Mr. Ravnik: I can definitely go into the detail in the original or the initial Comprehensive Plan amendment application that was submitted. They spoke about varied uses. There was an expansion on the southerly side of Starbird Road for the – call it a commercial venue, if you want, where you could have a celebration or a wedding or a family get-together. There was an expansion of the existing grapevines that are growing on the south side of Starbird Road. That was going to just about get doubled. They saw an area – and I don't know the history of why they thought that an RV park would be positive, but they wanted to have that type of a use. Then on the north side of Starbird Road there is an existing building that has been permitted for the tenant improvements to have a brewery. And in association with that to the north he wanted to do a bee's production – "bees" like bee hives – and hops. And then on that north side, one of the things that we joked about was when we were putting this information together was about having a general store – all right? And I joked and said let's call it Doc Bertelsen's General Store! Well, it kind of

stuck. And they were looking at things where people could get some recreational equipment or – you guys, you could get guides. You could get local produce available there. It's not meant to be a Whole Foods. It's not even meant to be a Safeway. Yeah. So those are the elements that – a dog park was slated on the south side also; RV park in state phases; expansion of the grapes area; expansion of the building view; expansion of the parking, which is already needed; and then the business activities on the north side.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay.

Mr. Ravnik: Some of it is presently served by the available water obviously, but they don't have a huge quantity. They do know that for all of this to come to a fruition you're going to need some public water, potable and for fire service too. So in a nutshell, that's it. I could go into more detail, if you'd like.

Commissioner Woodmansee: No, that's good. I just –

Mr. Ravnik: Sure.

Commissioner Woodmansee: You know, anything you think's helpful for us.

Mr. Ravnik: Right. Yeah, what's the big picture?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Right.

Mr. Ravnik: Exactly, exactly. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you. I was going to be looking for the same thing. Just out of curiosity, for dog parks, what do those entail? What do they require? I'm assuming just a field, but they might need water too. I don't know.

Mr. Ravnik: You know, I've always been a dog owner but if one lives in the city and has a dog then you probably go to a dog park often. I'll have to admit I've never been to a dog park. I could see areas where you can go out a throw chuck-a-balls. I could see areas where you could have some equipment where agility classes for dogs – you know, up the ladder, down the ladder, up the see-saw or whatever. I could very easily see a – you know, a small water body, especially in those soils. So I'm sorry that I can't go into further detail on that.

Commissioner Mitchell: That's all right. As a cat person, I don't know dog parks! I was just curious.

Mr. Ravnik: My dog would love it because she's really social, but she's getting old too so she doesn't run like she used to. For people – my daughter and some of my nephews have got dogs. They live in town. A dog park is a big amenity for them because they can take their animal out and be with other people who have similar interests. Exercise their animal. Unfortunately if you have a 6,000-square-foot lot in downtown wherever you just simply don't have room to go out and do stuff like that.

Commissioner Mitchell: So for general curiosity's sake, for the overall picture do you guys have, like, sizes in mind for these different areas already? Not just the uses, but how big they'll be within?

Mr. Ravnik: In the original application packet that we turned in I did give you areas, and there is a series of maps. For instance, on the north side of Starbird Road we identified an area for the brewery and the general store which would include parking, and we allocated approximately three acres for that. And this is on a colored 11 by 17 that you might have in your application packet. Then the area for Option B was in the order of about 29.3 acres, and that was, again, north of Starbird Road. And then on the south side they had two areas of overnight camping, which would be a phased type of a development, one on the order of 4½ acres in the northwest corner of the south half side of the road. We had existing grapes, we had existing winery facilities, overflow parking, and additional venues, the dog park, and then another second of third phase maybe of overnight camping at the south end on the order of 12 acres.

Commissioner Mitchell: If for any reason for business sizes and business purposes those sizes would need to be changed, is that a problem with them changing this acreage for different parts of it or not?

Mr. Ravnik: If I might respond to that, in the Small Scale Recreation and Tourism – and Jenn, you might chime in – there is a maximum limitation of 20 acres that could be assigned towards commercial and retail uses and the rest of it will have to all be amenities support activities. So that would probably limit the venue for the winery, maybe the hops. And if I remember correctly, in that maximum allocation of 20 acres – I’ll look it up for you – I think I estimated that there was on the order of 12 to 14 acres of Small Scale Recreation and Tourism that was performed or could be performed through the proposal.

Commissioner Mitchell: Good. The reason for the question was wondering, you know, how much flexibility there is as this gets started and then gets developed – if there is some wiggle room for flexibility _____.

Mr. Ravnik: You know, I’m sure that there is but keep in mind one of the factors here is that it *has* to be accessory to a recreational tourism activity.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah. Right.

Mr. Ravnik: So if you don’t have the band leader you don’t have the band.

Commissioner Mitchell: True. Thank you.

Mr. Ravnik: Yes, ma’am.

Chair Raschko: ____, please.

Commissioner Jennifer Hutchison: I would just like to comment that your original plan the way it was submitted that I received is very carefully thought through and well proposed. I find that all of these creative activities work nicely together and I hope to see a happy outcome.

Mr. Ravnik: Thank you. Well, I have to pass glory on to the people who created it. I had a black felt pen sketch on a piece of 8½ by 11 paper. And that’s where it all started. And they said we want these amenities and these amenities and can we do it and what’s the Comp Plan? So thank you very much.

Chair Raschko: Okay, anybody else?

Commissioner Knutzen: Real quick one – just curious: When did this project start on paper, when you were doing that? A year ago, two years ago, three years ago? Has it been going on for a while? The thought process of the main plan.

Mr. Ravnik: Middle of last year? Because we made the submittal by July 31st of 2021 and it wasn't – maybe April of 2021 was when I first got involved.

Commissioner Knutzen: Well, of course, to begin with it's been up here since 19-what?

Mr. Ravnik: Well, that and go back to, you know, when – the winery was started in 2014, beer started in 2017. The popularity was kind of off the charts.

Commissioner Knutzen: When did the winery open – about?

Mr. Ravnik: 2014.

Commissioner Knutzen: That's – gee, eight years ago?

Mr. Ravnik: Yeah.

Commissioner Knutzen: Okay. Thank you. My memory isn't as good as I thought it was.

Mr. Ravnik: That's okay.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Hutchison?

Commissioner Hutchison: Quickly, to clarify too: It was noted in here in several areas that the process of the full development was to be over five to 10 years. Am I – is that still accurate, or do you think you can move it faster if it's approved?

Mr. Ravnik: Some of the aspects could be done now – all right? – but water is a primary component. Okay? There are some activities that they would like to do within the confines of the structures that they have so they can expand their program, their deliverables to customers and patrons. I know right now they have 300 wine members and they can't accept anymore because they're maxed out on their production of wine. And so they need to increase their production of wine to serve all the wine members over and above all the people that come in to visit. Tour buses come in to visit.

Commissioner Hutchison: Thank you.

Mr. Ravnik: Yeah. Can they do it faster? If it's economically driven and there's ___ I would venture to guess yes.

Steve Bertelsen: May I speak?

Mr. Ravnik: You may. You have to come up here to the podium and introduce yourself.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Mr. Bertelsen: Thank you. I'm Steve Bertelsen and I just wanted to say – reflect on that. We are happy where we are with the members that we have. We really don't want to expand that much.

We're not – you know, we're not chasing that big pie in the sky. We just want to make this a community thing and have everybody enjoy it. And so thank you for – I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Ravnik: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Anything more? Please.

Vice Chair Candler: The idea of the RV park: Is that envisioned to support this venue of weddings and things like that, or is that more directed toward the vineyard? What is kind of – how does that relate?

Mr. Ravnik: If you don't mind, I would like to defer to the applicant on that level of detail.

Chair Raschko: Please.

Mr. Bertelsen: Yeah.

Ali Bertelsen: Hello, I'm Ali Bertelsen. So with the RV park, there's this program out there called "Harvest Hosts." It's all over the country and it's more geared towards breweries and wineries. It's a – you kind of belong to this club and go and park your RV at these farms, wineries, breweries, and it's a short stay. So that's kind of what we're thinking with the RV. Also it's more of like the higher end RVs so it's not just any RV off the side of the street can come in. It's more geared towards showing our winery and the brewery and the farm tours for that.

Mr. Ravnik: It's not a 1968 Winnebago.

Ms. Bertelsen: Right, yeah. That'd be more limitations. Yeah.

Vice Chair Candler: Is the idea of the dog park kind of for those folks or – what are –

Ms. Bertelsen: And the community. Yeah, definitely the community. I think the dog park – we have a lot of dogs come to the winery now and it's just what our customers are wanting. They're wanting to expand that and bring their dogs, have a place for their dogs to go and run and play. We have them all on leashes now at the winery when they come visit. But we are dog-friendly so it's a huge draw for customers. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: So with the idea of the RV and the dog park and the fields and things like that it just – it comes to mind on, you know, the trails within for your people to use while they're there. Is that something that has to be in the plan or can you just do those where you need or want?

Ms. Bertelsen: Um, I –

Mr. Ravnik: Were you thinking of walking trails?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah.

Mr. Ravnik: I live out in the country and my walking trail is the same path that the tractor uses when he makes his rows between fields. It always changes. Sometimes it's muddy. I would

venture to guess that just the agricultural activities of maintaining the grapes and the space in between the rows and the production of the hops on the north side – there's probably going to have to be *some* maintenance of trails but the vast majority, I think, would exist just by result of.

Commissioner Mitchell: It looks from the map layout from the map that you've got some opportunity there between your, you know, proposed RV camping area and where some of the other things would go. Thank you.

Ms. Bertelsen: Thanks.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I actually just have a comment. I think this location is prime for this kind of an activity because if you think about the agritourism and, you know, getting deep into farms and stuff like that, you know, you can create a traffic issue and some stuff like that if you get too big of a thing going on. But here this property is literally next door to I-5 so nobody could ever say that there's a traffic impact to anybody, which is a big issue to me in this type of venue. You know, so that you're not plugging up the local small roads when you're having your activities going on. And so my thought on this is that if we – and that, to me, is a big deal. And so I think it's just a prime location to expand what's already an extremely popular destination from not only just locals but people from out of county that – to me, it can be a real shining star for Skagit County's community and our economics.

Mr. Ravnik: Most definitely.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So I think the location is it's actually a perfect location for something like this. And I see a lot of vision, or a lot of thought has went into, you know, how can we utilize these properties, and I just think the concept is a good concept. So that's my comment.

Mr. Ravnik: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner?

Commissioner Hutchison: Not to put too much pressure on the question about the camping: You have it noted as just overnight and I wonder, because of the clientele that you're trying to attract, that would probably be more of a week-long or a two-week stay, which would benefit the entire area because they'd be tourism. My only question, though, is, How would you manage that if you had a visitor or guest refuse to vacate? Is there a process in your administrative side that would address that? I only ask because we have the agritourism plans coming up in the future, which might be a year or two out but we'd want to reflect on what's working and how to limit future policy, so to speak. So I'm curious if you have anything.

Mr. Ravnik: We're getting down into the details on this one, but I think I would not see a long, extended stay there if I did something like that, because I see predominantly dry camping. You know, if PUD water does become available, great, but to have somebody come in and visit Skagit County and stay a day or two or night or two out at the winery, maybe hop out to Bayview State Park and stay for a little bit out there. I think that if you started going into longer stays I think you start pigeon-holing yourself into having to have more amenities. Okay? So I don't see a preponderance to make this a week-long stay for those reasons. If someday they can, hey, more power to them, but I think with the availability, the program. If they have a family get-together, a two-night stay would be perfect. Maybe even just a one-night stay, but I don't – and that's totally

up to them. I wouldn't envision that the week or definitely not the two weeks. We're not on the coast or anything like that. Is that okay?

Ms. Bertelsen: Yeah, it's fine.

Commissioner Knutzen: Based on what you just said, you're not looking to turn this into an RV campground.

Mr. Ravnik: No.

Ms. Bertelsen: No.

Mr. Ravnik: No. The RV – the ability to stay overnight in an RV is just an accessory use to the winery.

Commissioner Knutzen: Right, and it *has* to be accessory.

Mr. Ravnik: It *has* to be.

Commissioner Knutzen: So this will be associated with your customer.

Mr. Ravnik: Yes, yep. Yeah, it has to be recreational tourism. Right.

Commissioner Knutzen: Good. Thank you.

Mr. Ravnik: Okay. Anything further?

Chair Raschko: Are there any further questions?

Commissioner Knutzen: You look at me every time.

(laughter)

Chair Raschko: I do have a question. It's a little off the wall, but you're going to grow hops.

Mr. Ravnik: Yes, sir.

Chair Raschko: And it's already been established this is not agricultural ground. It's just a glacial drum, one covered without wash. And hops are grown in a hot climate like Yakima and we have a maritime climate, so are these hops going to be more for ambience?

Mr. Ravnik: Actually, sir, I have hops at my house and I live at the intersection of Cook Road and Pulver Road. And I cut those hops down to the ground every single year and the darn things grow 20 to 25 feet long.

Chair Raschko: Well, that's great.

Mr. Ravnik: So I don't do anything. If I had the soils and the racks and could apply the fertilizer, I'll betcha you could have one heck of a hop growth.

Chair Raschko: Well, I've seen wineries that have two acres of grapes just for – to make it look like a winery.

Mr. Ravnik: Yeah, yeah.

Chair Raschko: So I was just kind of curious as to whether it was a similar effect – not that it makes any difference.

Mr. Ravnik: No, I think the hops are purposely intended as an element of the brewery.

Chair Raschko: Great. Is there anything else?

Commissioner Henley: I have a question. Your grape production is roughly six acres or thereabouts. That's not a lot of grapes. Why wasn't one of the options expanding the vineyards? Is it a problem with the soil or a problem with the water?

Mr. Ravnik: No, matter of fact we were speaking just this evening before the Planning Commission and the hardness, the rockiness of the soils – you used the word “strain.” The grapevines like the strain of having to try to grow through that. I also know that they bring grapes in from eastern Washington, too. So there is production, there is the ambience. I don't know the ___ activity _____ eastern Washington.

Commissioner Henley: Well, my question is is instead of leaving the grape production where it is, which is what your proposal is, why not, say, expand it to 10 acres or 20 acres or something like that? Or is it you just don't want to be in that part of the business?

Mr. Ravnik: Sir, I cannot respond to that question. That's a personal business profile. And yes, sir, you can go ahead.

Mr. Bertelsen: That was our whole intention, was to have that whole field full of grapes. And we just do not get enough heat units on this side of the mountains to get a large enough –

Commissioner Henley: So you can't get the grapes ripe.

Mr. Bertelsen: I'm sorry?

Commissioner Henley: Basically you're saying you can't get the grapes ripe enough.

Mr. Bertelsen: Well, the yield that –

Commissioner Henley: The yield is down.

Mr. Bertelsen: Yeah, is down.

Commissioner Henley: I understand the grapes.

Mr. Bertelsen: So I talked to the wine grower president and he basically told us we were kind of crazy for growing grapes on this side of the mountains. You know, San Michel, they tried to do it and, I mean, we're never going to give up on it but we are – it just – we're not going to expand like we initially thought.

Commissioner Henley: How many cases do you produce now?

Mr. Bertelsen: We are just – 25 to 3,000 cases a year.

Commissioner Henley: Thank you.

Mr. Bertelsen: Yeah, thank you.

Chair Raschko: All right, any final questions, comments?

Mr. Ravnik: Thank you for the 10 or 15 minutes.

(laughter)

Chair Raschko: Thank you very much for the presentation and thank you for your help as well. Okay, with that we'll move from the 2022 Docket to the 2023 Docket Preview.

Thank you so much. Thank you for your kind comments, Ken.

Jenn Rogers: Thank you, Commissioners. So first I did want to update. So we only had one petitioner here tonight because we had two citizen-initiated petitions, which are LR22-01, which is what you just heard on – so LR22-05, which was the farmworker housing accessory use amendment, he has rescinded that application. So that will no longer be on the docket for your consideration moving forward. His intention is to reach out to the community a bit more and get a more specific proposal then potentially submit it for the docket next July. So it would be on the 2024 docket if he decides to bring it back.

So I'll move on. Our deadline for the 2023 docket was the last business day in July. So we did get five applications from the citizens of Skagit County this year. So tonight I'll just do a brief overview of that. We haven't done a lot of analysis on this. This is just a preview for you before we move into further analysis next year.

So first is LR23-01, the Dunlap Rural Reserve Rezone Request. The petitioner has requested to rezone about 21 acres of Agricultural-Natural Resource Lands to Rural Reserve. The petitioner stated that the properties that he is rezoning are on an upland so they're not farmable. And the new zoning would allow the petitioner to subdivide the parcels and build new homes on the property. I think he's trying to get one to two more parcels in that area.

I've got the map blown up here. So you've got about five parcels that would be affected and that would be rezoned here. So there's an aerial photo too that I have. So you can kind of see what he's trying to do is follow the toe of the upland and rezone the areas that aren't farmable but still keep the areas that is adjacent to that are being farmed. Those would stay Ag-NRL.

Are there any questions on that?

Chair Raschko: Yeah, is that Dodge Valley? Or no?

Ms. Rogers: Well, it's just south of La Conner, right along the Swinomish down there.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Is the proponents the Dunlap family, or would it be Dunlap Towing Company?

Ms. Rogers: Oh, the Dunlap family, yes.

Chair Raschko: The family? Okay.

Ms. Rogers: There's multiple – there are multiple owners of these parcels so we have sort of ___ from each of those parcel owners in the application.

Chair Raschko: Are there other questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Rogers: LR23-02, the Cummings Rural Intermediate Rezone. The petitioner here is requesting to rezone about 10 acres of Rural Reserve land to Rural Intermediate. The property currently sits within a Mineral Resource Overlay so it is not eligible for a CaRD subdivision. So he would like to rezone to Rural Intermediate so that he could subdivide the property into two parcels and build a second home on the second parcel. So I'll blow up the map here a little bit. So this is in south Anacortes, right along Havekost Road. The property is on Olga Road just off of that. So there's a large, denser neighborhood that is Rural Intermediate just to the west and south of this property.

Any questions?

Chair Raschko: Any questions on 02?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Ms. Rogers: LR23-03: This is the Port of Skagit Bayview Ridge Rezone. The petitioner is requesting to rezone a portion of parcel number 21003 from Bayview Ridge-Residential to Bayview Ridge-Light Industrial. The parcel currently is a split zone between those two. And that is the result of the update that we did on the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan in 2014. So that small – I'll blow up the map here. So you can see just on the east side of it you've got a small part that is zoned Bayview Ridge-Residential on the same parcel. So originally that was going to be – it was zoned as a Community Center zone. They decided not to build a community center and they didn't want to keep one zone just for one tiny part of the subarea plan so they changed it to Bayview Ridge-Residential. But ultimately this parcel was left split, so they would like to rezone it to allow for some larger development, which fits quite well in with the Bayview Ridge area. So they'd like to do that rezone so they can develop this.

Commissioner Knutzen: A question on that? I've been trying to place Bay Ridge Fire Station. I'm guessing on the left-hand side?

Ms. Rogers: It's quite a few – it's down – it's west.

Commissioner Knutzen: Oh, is it that little square, 22006?

Ms. Rogers: If I'm remembering correctly, it's farther west.

Commissioner Knutzen: Oh, okay.

Ms. Rogers: Yeah, so if you keep going down Peterson Road it's down there, if that's what I'm thinking of.

Commissioner Knutzen: So this is all east of the Bay Ridge Fire Station.

Ms. Rogers: Right. It's right on the edge.

Commissioner Knutzen: Up to where the houses are at.

Ms. Rogers: Correct. Right.

Chair Raschko: Anything else on 03?

Commissioner Mitchell: I've got a question. So the – thank you – so the uses that they're talking about, is it just a general change or do they have things in mind now? Is it a desire for in the future just to make sense of the zoning or do they have something in mind now?

Ms. Rogers: They haven't given a specific project right now. I know that they're prepping to try to have it developed in the future and a lot of those uses would not be compatible with a split zone property. And a lot of the uses that the Port would like to look into and that fits nicely in the subarea plan are larger industrial businesses.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Anybody else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Ms. Rogers: All right. So one more is a rezone. LR23-04, the Chavda Rural Center Rezone. So this petitioner is requesting to rezone about 2.65 acres from Small Scale Business to Rural Center. The rezone would allow the petitioners to add small storage and owner/operator/caretaker quarters accessory to the primary commercial use. And I'll blow this up again. So this is along Highway 20 at the junction with La Conner-Whitney Road. You know, there's a Shell gas station there. The gas station is on the property just west, so P21181, so they're owned by the same owner who is trying to rezone this small parcel just east of it. So as you can see, it is surrounded by agricultural lands but this is, like, a small cluster of commercial uses here at this junction between these two major roads.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Commissioner Amy Hughes: This parcel, was it dealt with just a few years ago at Planning Commission?

Ms. Rogers: I believe – was it – I believe it was 2014. I'd have to look at my –

Commissioner Hughes: Sounds right.

Ms. Rogers: Right. It was Rural Reserve and so the previous owner had requested it to rezone to Small Scale Business. They had a different project in mind and they ended up selling the properties. So it's a new owner now.

Commissioner Hughes: Oh, okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Knutzen: This is the stoplight right there. Farmhouse Inn, Wilbur Ellis Fertilizer?

Ms. Rogers: Right, if I'm remembering correctly.

Commissioner Hughes: So – excuse me. One more clarification.

Chair Raschko: Please.

Commissioner Hughes: So we went from, within the last eight years, from one zone to another and now a third.

Ms. Rogers: They're *requesting* to rezone again, yes.

Commissioner Hughes: Yeah. Okay.

Chair Raschko: Anything else on 04?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All right.

Ms. Rogers: And our last petition. This would – this is LR23-05, Bucko Rural Business Use amendment. So the petitioners have requested the County study the Rural Business zone in general to add new permitted uses. The petitioner stated the zone does not allow for sufficient amount of uses for owners that would like to expand businesses on their properties. Rural Business is very limited because the zone was created after the GMA was enacted to allow for these small, ongoing rural businesses to keep going with the business that they had at the time the GMA went into effect. They're kind of spot-zoned all over the county and in the uses in Rural Business it's essentially to allow them to keep operating the business that they have. So it doesn't have a lot of specified other uses that you could do on that property. And so she owns a property along Highway 20 between Burlington and Sedro-Woolley that has a very small property that is Rural Business, so she'd like to be able to do something different on her property. She hasn't given us any suggestions on what those uses might be, but she would just in general like that zone to have more uses allowed.

Commissioner Mitchell: Is there a map to go with this?

Ms. Rogers: I don't have a map with this one because it's not a rezone request. It'd be for all of Rural Business.

Commissioner Mitchell: It's just everywhere. But could we see something for where she is?

Ms. Rogers: Sure. Do you want me to try to look it up right now?

Commissioner Mitchell: If you don't mind, yeah. It's a starting point, if you will.

Ms. Rogers: Let me see if I can get going here. So she's got this green – this one zone right here, Rural Business. So she's right along the Urban Growth Area for Burlington and she's surrounded by Rural Intermediate. But the property, if I'm remembering correctly, is only two acres so it's very small if she wanted to consider a rezone request.

Commissioner Mitchell: Can you help me refresh: What is UR-CI?

Ms. Rogers: Urban Reserve-Commercial Industrial.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Can you switch that to the aerial?

Ms. Rogers: Yes. So she's right next door to – if you drive along Highway 20, it's a – they're doing estate sales there, and it's right next to a car/vehicle storage, or there's a car sale lot just west of it.

Commissioner Woodmansee: If you hit the aerial on the – to the left. Under "Common Maps" on the left.

Ms. Rogers: Oh, thank you.

Commissioner Woodmansee: There you go. So does it include the – also the car thing's there and then there to the –

Ms. Rogers: So it's right here. Is my mouse showing it for you?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yep.

Ms. Rogers: So I'm circling it right here. This is that property. So it goes all the way up to about here and then there's – this is a property on its own, this square here in the middle. There's some preexisting, multifamily units back here. But yeah, so her – the neighboring property's within the Urban Growth Area so they have a lot more allowed uses in that area compared to where she's at.

Commissioner Mitchell: Interesting.

Chair Raschko: So that's a private residence.

Ms. Rogers: I don't believe anyone's living there right now.

Chair Raschko: Oh. Any questions?

Commissioner Knutzen: This is another one of the docket items?

Ms. Rogers: Yes, it will be on the docket for 2023.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Did you – forgive me if my brain faded – did you already tell us what the list was that she *can* do now there, or the people that have that zone?

Ms. Rogers: So let me bring it up because it's –

Commissioner Mitchell: I know. Sometimes they can be really lengthy.

Ms. Rogers: And it's *not* lengthy. That's what's interesting. It mostly allows for what your use was prior to the GMA. It was like we put this zone there to say you could continue to do that, even though it's in the middle of the rural area and technically not compatible, this is how we allow for those ongoing uses. It'd be a lot more helpful if you had this in alphabetical order, huh? So here's some of the permitted uses. Is that readable for you all?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes, thank you.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So what if there's not an existing use, commercial use?

Ms. Rogers: Say that again.

Commissioner Woodmansee: It was meant to help things keep going, right?

Ms. Rogers: Correct. So if you had a business in the rural area that – you know, it's not in a cluster but we still wanted to allow them to continue doing that business even after the GMA came in and we changed our zoning maps and everything. It was a zoning designation that we could allow them to continue their commercial use.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So how does the code work if there's not an existing use?

Commissioner Mitchell: Is there a part 3 that says something else?

Ms. Rogers: I see what you're saying.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I'm guessing right now there's not an existing use.

Ms. Rogers: They're running like a home business kind of. They're doing estate sales out of it right now.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay.

Ms. Rogers: I just know that because I drive by it every day from home.

Chair Raschko: Anything else on 05?

Commissioner Mitchell: I've got a question. This may sound like a silly question, but how are you guys going to investigate what other uses can go in there?

Ms. Rogers: Well, that's what's hard, is that it, you know, it is vague on – so what would the uses be allowed. So it's something that we can – we'll probably look into, you know, how are we going to handle this. Is it allowing uses? Is it changing – you know, if someone – because now it's been you know, 30-some odd years since the GMA went into effect. And this is one of those things you have a new owner, you want to do something different with the property. How do we handle that from now on? But Hal, do you want to – do you have anything to add on that?

Hal Hart: No. Basically that's what we do. We look around at similar uses anywhere that we can draw comparisons to.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Anything else? Commissioner Hutchison?

Commissioner Hutchison: Would there be consideration of the possibility to even rezone her to one or the other adjacent zones since she's a single property right in the middle of –

Mr. Hart: (inaudible)

Ms. Rogers: And it's something she'd have to apply and you know, if she wanted to do a rezone that's a different – she'd have to apply for the rezone separately. One of the difficulties is she can't rezone to an Urban Growth Area. She can't rezone herself into it. So the adjacent properties have more uses because they're in the Urban Growth Area and she is not. And Rural Intermediate has a minimum lot size which is larger than her current lot size, which makes it difficult.

Commissioner Mitchell: One more question?

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: So would this plus the others for this 2023 – what's your target roughly and date to finish with all that?

Ms. Rogers: For 2023?

Commissioner Mitchell: Mm-hmm.

Ms. Rogers: It'll be – we'll hope to always have Board approval by winter 2024. Like I mentioned before, we can only update our Comprehensive Plan once per year and because of COVID we missed a year. So this year we've already updated the Comprehensive Plan once so the soonest they could do the next one is next winter, which just affects every application down the line.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you.

Ms. Rogers: Mm-hmm.

Chair Raschko: Anything else?

Commissioner Knutzen: Yeah. You go first.

Commissioner Hughes: No, because mine is off this topic.

Vice Chair Candler: Could you – I'm sure you'll do this going forward. It's not necessary tonight, but at some point are you going – what I'd like to see is a map of all of the RVs so we can see – well, I'm going to guess that already exists –

Ms. Rogers: All of the Rural Business zones that –

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah, because I just want to know – and I can look – but how much property in Skagit County would be affected.

Ms. Rogers: Right. And that's something that we did last – on the previous docket. I believe it was Small Scale Business, when we added a use to that. We had a list of all the other properties of what it would affect. We would do a similar analysis for this as well.

Vice Chair Candler: Sure. Thanks.

Chair Raschko: Okay, we'll do Commissioner Hughes and then Commissioner Knutzen.

Commissioner Hughes: My question's a little bit beyond the scope of just this, so if you want to handle this and then let me go at the end.

Commissioner Knutzen: You presented the ones here. Is this the last one?

Ms. Rogers: This is the last citizen-initiated petition.

Commissioner Knutzen: Okay. And then so just to make sure I'm clear in my head, these are citizen. All the ones that have been presented to the County, they will go before the Board of County Commissioners this fall and they will review them and choose none, some, or all – whatever?

Ms. Rogers: Right.

Commissioner Knutzen: And – oh, go ahead.

Ms. Rogers: On the timeline – and I'm sorry; I should have put the timeline graphic up here just to start with that – but the Board cannot start considering the next docket until it is completely finished with the current docket. So as soon as the Board adopts the 2022 docket, which will be about winter 2023, then we can move on to the 2023 docket. Does that make sense?

Commissioner Knutzen: Yeah.

Ms. Rogers: So then we did that this year. So they adopted the 2021 docket and then immediately – I think, like, the following afternoon we had it.

Commissioner Knutzen: Well, this presentation we heard earlier – Bertelsen – that's on the 2022 docket?

Ms. Rogers: Correct.

Commissioner Knutzen: So all of this stuff we're working on, going to be working on, has to be completed. We send it to the Board of County Commissioners and they have to approve it –

Ms. Rogers: Correct.

Commissioner Knutzen: – before they can even start looking at this.

Ms. Rogers: I'm just giving you a preview since we just got all the applications. I just wanted to give you a preview of what's coming.

Commissioner Knutzen: Oh. And I'm new here and so – no, thank you. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Amy.

Commissioner Hughes: I haven't asked of your time. When I came in here I was looking for a map of, first of all, the Ag-NRLs and all those associated. But watching you go through the map just now makes me realize it is online if I could find it. Could you give us a cheat sheet of how to use that i-map?

Ms. Rogers: Yes, I can.

Commissioner Hughes: Just kind of tell us quick – not right now, but just kind of email us quickly where to go to find the i-map and then we can play at our own desire after that.

Ms. Rogers: Yes, it's a great resource. I use it all the time. I will do that.

Commissioner Hughes: Thank you.

Commissioner Knutzen: Is it appropriate for us to get copies from you of what you just presented? Or is it so far away that you'd – and I'm asking whoever. If we – if the protocol is not to get that now –

Vice Chair Candler: I don't think there's anything wrong. Can I answer?

Chair Raschko: You may answer.

Vice Chair Candler: I don't think there's anything wrong with you getting it, but it is down the road – this is the introduction, so that's down the road. We'll be getting a lot more info.

Commissioner Knutzen: We're so far – yeah.

Vice Chair Candler: We'll be getting more information from the Department –

Ms. Rogers: And some of these might not be docketed so they might not even make it to _____.

Vice Chair Candler: _____ be in front of us.

Ms. Rogers: But if you'd like to review the applications, I can scan them in and if you want to look at them just for curiosity I don't think there's anything wrong with that. Hal?

Mr. Hart: Yeah, you can do that.

Chair Raschko: So I think that's it for 05. Joe?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a question about the County-initiated. Is there a list of that yet for 2023?

Ms. Rogers: We don't have that listed out yet. Usually it's about the fall-winter we start kind of asking around and looking. We have a system online where people can submit suggestions as well. So next winter we'll meet and discuss which of the County suggestions that will be added to the proposed docket.

Commissioner Woodmansee: A follow-up question? So you said we're a year behind, right? So we're always going to be a year behind. Is that right?

Ms. Rogers: And, I mean, it's not a complete year. I mean, it could be a difference between we can't adopt it in December but we could adopt in January.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay.

Ms. Rogers: We just can't adopt two updates in the same calendar year.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Right. Okay, so normally the 2023 would be adopted in 2023?

Ms. Rogers: Ideally, yes.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. So is there a plan to get us back to where the actual year of the deal is going to get adopted the year of the application so that people aren't having to put in an application in 20 – a deadline for 2023 that's *really* two years away?

Ms. Rogers: Right. I have talked to legal if there's a way we can kind of get ourselves back on track. I'd imagine with COVID that we're not the only county that this has happened to.

Mr. Hart: Whatcom County got offtrack during a lot of lawsuits back in the early 2000s. I'm trying to remember. I'll have to go back. But we did get back on track eventually. And I think it was – we'll need to check into this, but I think there's certain – if you're doing an item for the first time as a local government, I'm thinking that there's a way that you can adopt that outside of the normal process. So perhaps through the comprehensive plan process coming up we're going to be making a lot of changes potentially. That's where we would catch up. So I would think in the next year or two we might be able to do that. We'll talk to legal.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Because it doesn't seem reasonable to me that we would ask somebody to make an application by July of 2022 and we're not going to make a decision on it until December of 2024. I just – like, completely unreasonable to me that it would take that long. So if we're a year – I mean, we might as well not take applications for a year and just say, Okay, this is going to be – you know, we lost that year. Do you see what I'm saying?

Vice Chair Candler: I do but we have to get it done a lot sooner than – because we still have to get it to the Board and –

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, but this is all of 2023 – did I hear this right? That this won't get heard till 2024?

Ms. Rogers: So it starts – the analysis by the Board will start next winter. So it'll –

Commissioner Woodmansee: As in 2023.

Ms. Rogers: As in 2023. So the analysis will start winter 2023; docketing wraps up about springtime. So I think we adopted a docket – it was May or June of this year, and then that's when the Board approved what the docket would look like, and then it went to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Woodmansee: And we can't finish the process in 2023's applications until – we could –

Ms. Rogers: The soonest we could do it is January 1st, 2024.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. And then, so it's – yeah. Okay, the *soonest* we could do it. That would actually shorten the gap. It seems like that we should shorten the gap or figure out a way to get on-year.

Ms. Rogers: Certainly.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Because to me it'd be very confusing that you're applying really two years ahead.

Ms. Rogers: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Woodmansee: And not a reasonable timeframe. I mean, a lot can change in two years.

Ms. Rogers: Absolutely.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Just for clarification, when you say "winter 2023," do you mean 22-23 or 23-24?

Ms. Rogers: So when I say "winter 2023" I think between January and March of 2023.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So that'll be winter of 2022-23.

Ms. Rogers: Yes, I think. What is it – winter, December 21st?

(laughter)

Ms. Rogers: Sorry, that is misleading. Between January and March is what we'd hope for. And, you know, the last docket was so long it took a long time to get through it and so we're hoping to shorten that timeline with this docket.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: One more question since we're looking at the schedules ahead. When is the nightmare year for the big 7-year – are we calling it 7 or 8-year Comp Plan Update?

Ms. Rogers: 8-year.

Mr. Hart: At least 8-year.

Commissioner Mitchell: So when is that one? Aren't we about due for that, like '24 or '23?

Ms. Rogers: We will start our work next year, next calendar year. Next summer, I think, is when we officially start doing some scoping and community outreach.

Mr. Hart: The funding is available as of July 1 next year. What we're doing now is we're figuring out. We have to start now at figuring out other funds that might help us or other things that other departments want to accomplish or other folks in the community may want to accomplish. So we're programming it now.

Commissioner Mitchell: But even so, does the – who drives that? Is staff who drives that or does the Board drive how much would go on the plate, so to speak? Because you have a choice of how much you pack something, right?

Mr. Hart: Yeah. We always say the community starts that.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay.

Mr. Hart: You know, but the Board will regulate what's reasonable to accomplish.

Commissioner Mitchell: Right, how fast it comes in the door.

Mr. Hart: Yeah.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Okay. You say there are no staff-originated items? Okay. So is there anything else on the 2023 docket?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All right. Well, thank you very much. Finally on our agenda we are going to have an update on the Wireless Facilities Code Update. I believe some answers will be provided to the questions presented our last time.

Ms. Rogers: Okay, so thank you. Yes, we are here for our second work session on the Wireless Facilities Code Update.

So just a recap for anyone watching. The reason why we are going through these changes: First we need to modernize the Skagit County Code to remain consistent with the new technology and infrastructure that providers are using now for wireless facilities. Providers are using different infrastructure because of new technology and we need to make sure our code and procedures are up to date for when those applications come through our office.

Second, federal law has made some changes and is dictating that local governments create a more efficient process for installing – or for permitting wireless applications, so that requires shot clock time limits for wireless applications and reducing some of the regulatory barriers for those new facilities.

And as for the overall review process – so, like I said, today is our second work session. We had our first work session on July 26th. Staff provided an overview of the changes and answered a few questions from the Planning Commission with our consultant. Our consultant is not here tonight, so if there's any questions that you have that I can't answer they'll be addressed in the staff report.

On September 13th the Planning Commission will host a public hearing to allow for citizens to provide comments and verbal testimony, and then on September 27th the Planning Commission is scheduled to evaluate the public input and deliberate on the recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.

So the available documents can be found on our project website, which is at the link on the screen currently. You can view the introductory memo that the Department provided to the Planning

Commission prior to the meeting on July 26th, as well as the proposed code amendments in redline form. We do have some small edits to the code that will be updated and added when the staff report is released.

And also – so before the public hearing we will also post a staff report, a SEPA determination, and a Notice of Availability for the public comment period.

So first, one of the questions that was asked – Commissioner Woodmansee, I believe you asked this question – was, How many wireless applications we are receiving each year? These numbers are broken out based on building permits, building permits that have been submitted. So in 2021 we had no new wireless facility applications and we had 20 eligible facilities requests. And just a reminder, the eligible facilities requests are anytime they want to modify an existing pole or structure without making a substantial change to that structure. In 2022, so far we've had two new wireless facilities and 15 eligible facilities requests. Are there any questions on that? Feel free to interrupt anytime.

(silence)

Ms. Rogers: There was also a bit of discussion during the last meeting about design requirements and whether we would be making any changes due to the new federal mandates. So I just wanted to summarize a little bit about what the code says right now.

So currently the code requires non-wooden poles to be painted a color which blends into the surroundings. Antennas must be designed and located to minimize any adverse aesthetic impact. Landscaping must be used to minimize on-the-ground equipment. And this is new: The applicant must use stealth design to the maximum extent possible.

So I talked with our current planners and other staff who evaluate these applications as they come in to see what their input would be on, Do we need to change the language? Should we add anything to our forms? The overall answer was no. Wireless providers are very knowledgeable about industry standards. The applications that they are submitting are very consistent and similar to what we're looking for in the first place. So they're not getting any off-the-wall applications for an orange cabinet – right? So they think that what we have currently in the code is working and we don't need to add anything new afterwards.

One thing that they also do – so when Planning stopped taking these applications for new wireless structures or poles or what have you, they will send out the application for a comment to the relevant state and federal agencies and County staff. So anyone who would have relevant knowledge on what they should look like or what they should be looking out for has the opportunity to comment. And it has affected some of our applications and I have those examples here.

So one of them – this is in Anacortes along Highway 20. This was a proposal for a monopine wireless facility, which means that it would be stealthed to look like a tree. So you can see on the left, you know, there's a gap right there. On the right you can see where they've artificially put in what it would look like when they added the new monopine. During the comment period the Skagit Land Trust had concerns that the pole was located near blue heron populations. And because the pole looked like a tree they were concerned that the blue herons would land on it and get injured or – you know. So because of those comments they did change the design to have a flush mount monopole design.

There's another example. This one didn't ultimately end up being built but it did play into some WSDOT regulations that are currently in place. So this was a pole that was proposed along Chuckanut Drive. During the comment period both citizens and WSDOT had concerns about what it looked like. WSDOT has protections for roadways which are considered scenic within the Scenic Vistas Act. These protections do affect wireless facilities. So Chuckanut Drive, Highway 20, parts of Highway 9 are protected under this act and these protections do affect them, so WSDOT requested that they stealth the design further. So the provider submitted the design you see here. They were planning to make it look like a silo, which was similar to other structures in the area, to try to, you know, stealth it further, and that's what was ultimately approved and they ended up not building the pole after that. But I thought it was a good example of how WSDOT can kind of play into the design of some of these structures.

Commissioner Henley had discussed how we ensure that wireless facilities are complying with other federal requirements, particularly with the FAA. Like we mentioned previously, our code amendment does have language which requires that the applicant comply with any and all federal and state regulations that apply to their project. They must also submit a signed letter which states they have complied with those requirements.

The FAA specifically states that any tower that's either near an airport or over 200 feet must be submitted for registration and review by FAA officials. So in Skagit County that means any structure that is proposed within the Airport Environs Overlay will automatically be – our staff will automatically provide that to the Port of Skagit for review. And once those providers submit those applications to the FAA, they need a determination for each application that it will not have an effect on air travel nearby.

We do have a recent tower example that required review by the FAA. So this is still ongoing this year, the application. This would be for the Skagit 911 tower. So it's proposed to be 250 feet tall. One of the parts of the application is that you must submit photo arrays to show what it would look like from the street. So all their photos are essentially you can't see it from the street. The tower is required to be lit and marked, according to the FAA. That was one of the things that they came back with. And an FAA determination of no hazard to air navigation was issued on October 19th, 2021.

Any questions about that so far?

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: So if they did put something in there that can't be seen from the road anyway and it was somewhat near the airport, they would still have to have a light on top of it anyway?

Ms. Rogers: Because it's over 200 feet they have to have lights on top

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Rogers: That's basically the threshold, whether or not you're, quote, "near an airport" or if it's over 200 feet you need to check and make sure that your tower is complying with FAA.

Vice Chair Candler: So if I understood that, that's an either/or. At the airport it would be – or near the airport it would lower.

Ms. Rogers: Any tower – correct. Any tower within the Environs Overlay we would – our staff would provide to the Port of Skagit and they should also send it back to the FAA for registration of the pole and determination of no hazard to air or navigation.

So a couple other application requirements that we discussed includes – so some of these are in our building code, which is in the purview of our update here but is relevant to our conversation last time. So one of the building code requirements is a certified engineered design to ensure that safety measures are compliant with our building code. Our building plans examiner staff will also review those engineering reports and doublecheck that they are compliant as well. They have found mistakes in the past so they always want to make sure that they're reviewing them for accuracy.

The new code amendments, we are also requiring a radio frequency emissions report by an independent licensed engineer or certified professional that works for the provider to state that their emissions are compliant with FCC regulations.

As I mentioned previously, we will be releasing a full staff report with additional analysis later this month. So if there's any questions or concerns that you have tonight that you still have I can certainly add those to the staff report as well. But that wraps up my presentation for tonight.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Are there any questions or comments?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I've got one question.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Woodmansee: On the radio frequency emissions, you mentioned that – it says here by "independent, licensed engineer," but then you said that it could also be somebody qualified with the company?

Ms. Rogers: Yes, I'm sorry. I should have put that in the PowerPoint language. Yes, in the code language that you've reviewed, there's a line in there that states it can be an independent certified engineer or someone who is also licensed to do that work that works for the provider.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Gotcha. Okay. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Hutchison.

Commissioner Hutchison: Taking off on that, I believe the last time we met it was addressed about how that emissions report would be manufactured – whether it was independent to the system in question or if it was an alternate – if there's a way of measuring a combined value of impact across multiple systems that could be overlaying. And I believe the answer was it would only be the *individual* system being measured. I'm curious: Do we know how that measurement becomes – how are they testing these types of systems? Is there a way to –

Commissioner Henley: Except from the extensive set of formulas that are used to make that determination, and the distance isn't great. I mean, for example, you can run about a 1500-watt signal and fundamentally about 18 inches away from that you're within the safety limits. So if you're on top of a tower (and) you're running a few hundred watts, it's not going to make any difference at all. I mean, you'll meet all the requirements simply by going through the

measurements. So it's not going to be a problem. And cumulative isn't one of the things we're talking about.

Commissioner Mitchell: Can I ask him a question?

Chair Raschko: Are you done?

Commissioner Hutchison: I am. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Mitchell: So tagging on to the same thing, Commissioner Henley, if you don't mind answering if you can and/or it pops back to Jenn: For late people, reading what the guy said, so you've got the towers or something that's on a building or up a pole or something like that and it sounds like things went back to on how things were measured on the ground so it wouldn't be a problem for anybody. Well, if you're thinking of an urban setting or if you are in those apartments in those upper places, balconies, restaurants, and things like that, one of those puppies is right there. Is it the same answer that – beyond 18 inches?

Commissioner Henley: The FCC uses language such like whether you have a controlled environment or an uncontrolled environment. Controlled environment would be something like within your own house – all right? Uncontrolled environment would be within someone else's house that was nearby. And there's a whole set of measurement and structure that you need to go through to show that whatever is radiated from that antenna in both a controlled and uncontrolled environment meets the requirements. And it's fairly easy to do actually. It's not difficult.

Commissioner Mitchell: So back to the lay people: I'm picturing it 3-D ___.

Commissioner Henley: You're thinking cumulative antennas on a roof affecting _____?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, I'm thinking like you've got one here, one there, one – you know – and so I'm thinking, like, if you could envision an invisible bubble, sort of, of emissions, and when you said 18 inches that shortened everything up. Is that the norm or not?

Commissioner Henley: No, it varies. It depends on frequency of the emission, the power of the emission, the gain of the antenna. I mean, there's a whole lot of factors that are taken into consideration. But the ultimate thing is that the calculations have to be done, the measurements need to be made, and there are rules about all that, and they've been developed over the last couple decades. It's relatively new science but it's fairly thorough.

Commissioner Mitchell: So were you satisfied in the answers then?

Commissioner Hutchison: Well, are these calculations taking place in the environment to which the applicant is intending to put the facility?

Commissioner Henley: Yes. Yes, yes.

Commissioner Hutchison: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Well, I've got to ask: Are cumulative effects then really not a factor?

Commissioner Henley: Usually not. I mean, if you want to talk about an extreme cumulative effect, think of a big anti-missile radar site where you're putting out a couple of megawatts. Now if you stand in front of that, you're going to get your brain fried – literally, all right? I mean, you get in front of one of those powerful radar systems and you'll cook an egg in like about two seconds. But that's not what we're talking about here. We're talking about much less power – all right? – and probably having to go through walls and structures and trees and everything like that. So we're not talking about a lot of – how would I put it? – exposure, all right? We're talking about RF exposure in terms of health and then there's another characteristic we're talking about, RF interference with other services. So one is a health environment requirement and the other one is a requirement having to do with channel usage – all right? – and other people's rights to use a similar channel. But you have to take both measurements.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. You've been very helpful. Anything else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: No? Okay, does that conclude the –

Ms. Rogers: That does conclude it, so we'll have our public hearing at the next meeting on September 13th – I think.

Chair Raschko: All right, we'll all look forward to that! Thank you. Okay, we'll go to the Director's Update. Mr. Hart, please?

Mr. Hart: Yes. Good evening. Great discussion. I really appreciate it. I was looking up how many scenic corridors we have in the area. So there's the Cascade Loop, the Chuckanut Scenic Byway, the North Cascade Scenic Byway, the Skagit Valley Ag Scenic Corridor. I can send that list to you. I think people tend to forget just how many designated areas we have already.

All right, let's go – can you forward that? I appreciate it. Right, so this is just a reminder that on the 23rd – and hopefully I got that right, Jenn – at 10:45 a.m. the countdown. Hopefully the Commissioners will take action on the Master Program at that point. That's coming up. So let's go to the next slide.

This has been in the paper. I want to just take a second and talk to you all about it. So, you know, someone in our office said use the term "lineage" to explain, Why does our department have to do certain things that come down to us? And a lot of the lineage for regulations starts at the federal level, passed down to the state level, and the state in this case is adopting Wildland Urban Interface rules and regulations. They developed the regulations after years of just terrible fires, a lot of them in eastern Washington but not exclusively. At the one fire that I had to work on when I worked at the state many years ago, it was when it roared through Chelan County – 58 million dollars was the budget, and that was replacing telephone poles and wires and things that had been burned up. And people had been moving into the valleys, ever-increasing, and they were changing the fire operations. As more people moved in, they were no longer preserving the forest; they were preserving properties that were there. And so things were changing. And that was probably '94, '95, and so that was probably the '96 legislative – that was the Chelan Complex fire. And so it was very expensive.

And so over the years then they've kind of refined this down, and the way that this is working, the way they're bringing it out – and Jack, our building official, is the lead on this so I'm just kind of parroting what he says – but the DNR and our fire marshal's office will be working with people.

And remember we do about 230 homes a year out in the rural areas – unincorporated areas outside of the Urban Growth Areas typically. And we also do a lot of additions. And so the idea is really that when they come in – when they come in one at a time, we’re talking about materials on the house that are less flammable than what they might otherwise pick to put on their house. We’re talking about these zones around the house, like the first five feet; we talk about the next five to 30 feet; and then we talk about 30 to 100 feet. And those are – we’re trying to reduce the fire risk overall that both individuals, communities – and then the state is ultimately – they come in and rebuild infrastructure after one of these terrible fires. And so as we’ve had more people move in, the fire losses get worse. And now we’re looking at more and more fires – extended heat things that may be different than what we’ve had in the past or maybe not, but that’s part of what they’re saying to us. And we’re looking around at other counties and they have adopted these as well. King County has adopted similar. Again, the state is asking us or telling us that this is what we need to do so we are complying with that.

The other areas beyond the – around the house – we’re looking at the larger neighborhood or community you’re within, and so we’re looking at how to prevent fire there, as well. If you were doing a new subdivision, one of things we used to talk about after the firestorm in the 1990s is you need an escape route. So you can’t just go in one road and have 60 roads on a – you know, going up one way, because people were getting trapped. And so then they lose everything and they have to scramble to get out of there. So try and have an escape route when you design subdivisions that can be a way to get out.

There’s a lot of other design things to think of in community, but really it’s the landscape that you’re trying to fireproof, so it’s understory and stuff like that. There are some really good videos that are available on this. We played one for the Commissioners this week. I can send you the linkage to those. I looked at it again before this presentation as well.

Let’s go to the next slide. So another update. So we are moving forward. It’s called WUI and we can get you more information if you’re interested.

Agricultural Tourism: We’ve been working on this one. We are still. One thing I don’t have for you today are specific dates, but we would like to propose a series of – I have three outreach, but we may be doing two outreach and one large public meeting, or three outreach. And we’re going to calendar this, working with various partners as we do that. And then I think the big part of this will be right up front. We want to do a robust survey. And we’re talking about 12,000, up to something like about 16,000 parcel that would receive information about, Hey, you’re in these areas, you know. You have a chance to tell us what you want to see for the future. So give the community a chance to say something about that. And we’re also talking about really simplifying the survey. Surveys before this were too complex. So we’ll get more information as soon as it’s available. I’ll be talking about this to begin tomorrow night with the Ag Advisory Board as well. So hopefully we’ll have some calendar dates between now and then, but this is what we’ve come up with after really working through trying to say, Okay, what can we get done this year and what are we hearing from people? What do we want to do? So this is kind of the outcome. Are there any questions on this one?

(silence)

Mr. Hart: Okay, then we’ll go to the next one, Raspberry Ridge. Raspberry Ridge has been – we’ve had a number of efforts at Raspberry Ridge. It’s just outside of the city of Burlington. The housing authority has been doing projects here. I think we have three other – I think we have – if I’ve got that right, three projects have been done and there’s another one that we were working

on this evening even when I went to, you know, make this little picture, that we were saying, Okay, how many units can they get there? Can they do 30 units or 31 units left and can they also do a caretaker residence at the same time? So we're working through legal on that. But the concept here is we desperately need more housing in the valley. We need to find a way to get that and this is one of the things that's – it's one of the projects that's coming up. They had a predevelopment meeting last week – and I'm just giving you the heads-up on that. And so I would think that in '23 – or, excuse me; yeah, in '23 we'd probably see a project getting off the ground. That would be my hope. As soon as possible.

So let's go to the next one. This is another one. This is called West Coast Reductions. I finally went out to the site. West Coast Reductions is a tallow operation where they – there's new rail services just behind those towers, and Vanderyacht is also coming out there and doing a propane project in that line behind – I think right now there are two lines; I think there are going to be four or five rail lines there for cargo storage. So think that there's going to be more activity down in the heavy industrial area like this. This will be at – when they're done this year, later on this year there should be 12 new employees on this site is what's expected. And they're not 24 hours at this point. They could go to 24 hours. Their other facility – and this serves BP, so all across Canada. They have another one coming in to Tsawwassen. I think there's a Tsawwassen facility. And that one is 24 hours production. But they're just building up their production for green fuel sources, and this is what they're doing.

Commissioner Mitchell: What was the location on this again?

Mr. Hart: This is – I'm trying to think of the road that goes down there to Vanderyacht. I'll have to get back to you on that road.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay.

Mr. Hart: But it's at the southern end of the industrial zone. Sierra Pacific is real close.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Hart: And then there's also a concrete plant right there too in that area. Okay. Let's go to the next one. This is another one. There's more jobs here. I just was talking to the proponents a little while ago and they're saying, Hey, we're going to have up to 35 jobs, perhaps even more. And they are working to complete this in '23. It's under construction and should be completed by '23. This is from last week. I'm sorry if I'm not loud enough, but that'll be 35 jobs. That's Chuckanut Brewery.

Commissioner Knutzen: Is that at the Port there by the brewery?

Mr. Hart: Yep, yep. That's up there right now, and there's some really other exciting jobs that I'll talk about – or projects coming in.

Let's go to the next one. Oh, this is a really good one thanks to Sarah. Sorry, Sarah. I'm putting you on the spot. Is that okay?

Ms. Ruether: Sure.

Mr. Hart: So the Planning Commission at Anacortes has – they've got a good presentation, so there's a link to this presentation which we can send to all of you. But it tells you what's going on.

Here's a city I think is doing a good job. So far this year they've got 61 new dwelling units. They have – 52 of these permits have been issued of the 61. Twenty of those are new single-family residential. They've got 12 new cottages. They have eight duplexes. Oh, I think I'm being repetitive there. But six ADUs and 15 townhomes divided in three different buildings. So they're keeping track of it and they have good data that they're showing, which is what we hope to do here this year as well. So we're – the jurisdictions are meeting on Thursday and we're looking at kind of having the buildable lands discussion. We're not required to do that but we are required to show how we're utilizing our Urban Growth Areas, how we're utilizing – how the Cities are utilizing their lands that have been given to them by the County. And so this is an example. So they also – you know, they have plans, and it's in this presentation, for a denser community on the waterfront as well. So that's very impressive and it's probably a multiple year buildout that will go for some time.

But Anacortes is changing, and that was the – you know, *how* it's changing and which way it's going. It's very interesting and it's interesting to compare and contrast different efforts in our cities right now. So we haven't heard much from Anacortes so this is a good update.

Chair Raschko: Okay, there's a question from Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: So what is a cottage?

Mr. Hart: Yeah. I would have to look at their definition in Anacortes for a cottage, but you may have it.

Ms. Ruether: They're these small single-family homes that are clustered and then they have a common area. It was a way to get a little bit more density, and they put them close together and they're a little bit smaller. And then they saved some wetlands too. It's a way of clustering your housing to still have the same density but, like, preserve wetlands and have smaller units for different family sizes.

Commissioner Mitchell: What's the upper limit for the size?

Ms. Ruether: I don't – I mean, I don't remember. I think it's probably, like, around 1600, 1700 square feet is the maximum size.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay. Ballparking's fine. Thanks.

Ms. Ruether: Okay!

Mr. Hart: You might remember Sedro-Woolley did that many years ago and there's a good example of some cottages. I always kind of look – it's right next to the front gate of the Swift Center when you're going in there. So it's to the left. Those were done, and I remember the tours back in the early 2000s. It's also interesting to see how that construction has held up over 20 years and how people are keeping it up. It's close quarters, but some people really, really enjoy that.

Let's go to the next one. And I will say that some of the other projects that I've just been pulling together, you may have heard we have a seafood plant that could be coming in in 2023 and we've been working on that. That will be a very large project with employment. There's Vanderyacht, which I talked to the folks that are constructing that. That's a multi-phased yacht company that's moving up to the Port, and that will have – I believe it'll have, oh, 35 to 100 – something like that – employees. So we do have some other projects in the mix but those are two that tend to stand

out for '23. And so what I like to do is estimate – and by going around and calling everybody we've talked to: Are you really going forward with this project this year? What's the – and so right now there's a lot of uncertainty because they keep raising interest rates. But these are the projects that people say, We're still moving ahead with. And so I have about six to eight that I know right now that are going to come in. There should also be – I think there's one large agricultural building that's out there, around 100,000 square feet or so too. So we tend to get those each year as well. And that's all I've got right now.

Chair Raschko: Okay, are there questions for Mr. Hart?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a couple questions. Going back to the Wildland – WUI – what exactly is that process? And you're inferencing that there's going to be code changes. Is that a public process or –

Mr. Hart: Yeah. The code already changed. The building code was changed over a year ago but they held off on it because what the building code needed was DNR maps to say, Where's the interface zone – right? And where are those areas adjacent to the interface zone? So if you're in the interface zone, that's where we would really – we're coming up with the document by asking *you* questions when you come in about where you are. There has been some concern in other counties – I think there was a recent article that I just found – that had moved ahead, ahead of us, about how accurate the DNR map is, to begin with. So kind of the question I have would be, Okay, if we think the DNR map isn't entirely accurate, what's our fallback? Can we use, you know, just the wisdom of the county in a case like this where this doesn't look like it's within a WUI. And they gave us statewide maps that allow us to kind of go down to the parcel level and they've identified some parcels. And I've already had some people come to me and say, Hey, they've identified *my* parcel but I don't think I'm in that zone. What's my fallback going to be? And so I need to make sure I have a good answer for that, and those are kind of things that we're working through right now – the details. When you pass a map out, you're generally in it, and when you get to your parcel you want to know if the parcel's identified or not.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, I guess my concern is that there's not a lot of public knowledge about this and that it – I mean, it sounds to me like a big deal as far as changes. If you're going to get all the way down to telling people what kind of product they can put on their siding of their house and stuff like that, that's kind of a big deal. And so I'm just curious as to that process. And has staff analyzed what it really means? I mean, you know, these three materials are going to be ruled out in these interface areas and –

Mr. Hart: Yeah, a lot of the – we know that the materials are often – some of the ones that are most used, like most of your asphalt shingle products that are currently in use in the county would be good. So, you know, obviously we're not doing cedar shakes anymore and things like that in those areas. But the other portion of this is what you can do with your – what you should do to fireproof the property. And so the way that it's set up is that you kind of do some of the land use fireproofing component – like the first five feet, if you were to put gravel around that instead of shrubs that could ignite, or trees really close to your house that would ignite your roof or a portion of the home. So those recommendations have been out there for many years and they're not changing necessarily those recommendations.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So to follow up that, so I'm – maybe it's my own ignorance, but I'm not aware of, like, major fire issues in our county like we have. I couldn't tell you a major fire that destroyed homes and stuff in Skagit County since I've lived here. And so I'm concerned that we're taking a one-size-fits-all look at this. The state said you need to do this and whatever. But we're

fixing a problem that potentially doesn't even exist and just regulating people to the point of you can't put this particular plant next to your house because we want you to have a five-foot clear zone. I get that in eastern Washington. I'm designing a shop over there that's going to be noncombustible frame, noncombustible siding, noncombustible roof. There's not going to be a plant within 100 feet of it because it's in a fire hazard area. But I don't – I'm not aware that we have these major fire issues in Skagit County that are, like, necessitating that much more control over their community.

Mr. Hart: Yeah, I understand that. The way we're looking at it, I think, is that it's a negotiation with people when they come in to try and use materials on the home that are less likely to ignite into a fire. And it's – again, it's a combination of both doing pre – kind of some pre-work things when you go to develop your property – and it's really – this is aimed at new homes as they come in.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah. So if I'm a good negotiator I might get what I want and if I'm not a good negotiator I might not, huh?

Mr. Hart: No. I think we have the – we do have a form that you fill out and as you fill that out you can see how it moves towards using certain asphalt products on your roof that would be protective against fire.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, the whole concept concerns me just because I'm in the business and I had no idea this was going on – these changes – and to this level, you know?

Mr. Hart: I'll have Jack – I'll make sure Jack gives you guys a call. He did a presentation, a pretty good presentation on it yesterday and I would love for him to – we can probably send you that presentation or do something like that so you can see.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Maybe the whole Planning Commission would like to see it.

Mr. Hart: Yeah.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Anyways...when I say "in the business," I don't mean that I have something that it's going to affect. I just mean, you know, that's the world I live in and so....

Mr. Hart: Yeah.

Commissioner Woodmansee: The other question I had was on buildable lands.

Mr. Hart: On which land?

Commissioner Woodmansee: The buildable land comment you made?

Mr. Hart: Oh, yeah. Yeah, yeah.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So – and again, my ignorance – you may be able to fix me here. On – I, for 15 or 20 years, heard the Cities say, We have plenty of buildable land – at the same time, being in the business I was in, knowing that I can't find a piece of property anywhere to do x on. So did I hear you say that there's going to be a discussion about or that the Cities are going to need to identify? They can't just say, Well, we have this many acres that's this many _____. They're going to have to be more in depth and identify how they're really calculating the units that they're –

Mr. Hart: Yes. We're trying to – it's been about a three-year discussion so far, but the Cities all did it different ways and so there wasn't really a uniform way. Mount Vernon would do it its way, Anacortes would do it its own way, and Burlington would do it a third way. So we're trying to get them to kind of agree to a general methodology that they would all do it. It's not to say that any one of those methodologies is wrong, or anything like that, but at the end of the day we're trying to compare apples to apples and understand why we're not building as many housing units as we are. Right? And we're the second – I think we're the second worst county for housing availability for the units that are out there right now, and it only – apparently Gray's Harbor beat us this year, and I'm not exactly sure what's going on over at Gray's Harbor but they're having issues over there. So, yeah, we need to build more for sure.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah. Well, one more follow-up to that. Another thing that would be helpful, I believe, for the public to see and for stakeholders to understand is, like, a grading system. So there's x-amount of acres in, say, in the city of Mount Vernon. Well, there may be 40% of those Urban Growth acres that have *severe* wetlands, *severe* logistical issues as far as services go. And so, you know, I know it's a 20-year buildable plan and stuff but if 70% of your buildable land has got these severe conditions, is that taken into consideration or is it more of a higher level look at it?

Mr. Hart: I think the Cities do take that into consideration first when they ask for the Urban Growth Areas that they've received. But our concern is how they're utilizing what they have been given.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Sure.

Mr. Hart: Right? And so you can see where tonight that Anacortes has done a number of things, and different housing types are in play. For a city like that, I think they have more than Mount Vernon, which is larger – right? – in play. And their approach is, you know, kind of across the board. They have apartments going up, they have townhomes. And so they're able to use the land more efficiently, and that's really what we're saying. We want them to use that (as) efficiently as possible.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Sure. Okay, thank you.

Mr. Hart: You bet.

Chair Raschko: Yes?

Commissioner Hutchison: I just had a follow-up question for you. Commissioner Woodmansee _____ fire zone information. You guys are talking about the roofing materials and I'm sure you're considering siding, but are you also looking at recommendations for the framing, the insulation, and everything else that's under the exterior?

Mr. Hart: I'll let Jack answer those questions. He's – yes, we are looking at that. Especially we're looking at gutters as well, and they're saying they're recommending gutter guards too because they're having a lot of problems with gutters igniting when they're full of needles and full of other things. So that – I mean, it does get very specific of what they're making recommendations for for new construction in unincorporated areas where you have a high fire danger apparently. And, again, I'm not saying – I wasn't even up to speed on this until – you know, we knew they had put it off a year or two ago to come up with the DNR maps. The DNR maps are out and therefore now we have to apply that. So we're trying to get the word out as well.

Commissioner Hutchison: Thank you.

Mr. Hart: Yeah.

Chair Raschko: Anything else for Mr. Hart?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Thank you very much. A very informative report.

Ms. Rogers: Chair? If I may?

Chair Raschko: Yes.

Ms. Rogers: There is one more thing I wanted to talk about, which was the tour on the 23rd. If we may? So I brought up last year's agenda just to show as reference. So we have confirmed all of the stops outside of Amazon. So they're all done with their construction so the contact that we had used last year is no longer working on the project as of this point, is what he informed me.

So the plan will be it'll start at 2:30. We will meet at the Port. At the Port, the will start – so Sara and Heather will start with a presentation on their planned growth in the future, what they're working on currently. Then we will go out onto the airport tarmac and discuss their expansion of the apron and some new hangars that they have on the facility as well, so we will be able to see that at the same time. We will then take a short drive down to go see one of their stormwater facilities off of Higgins Road, just briefly just so you can kind of see, you know, something that we just recently discussed with stormwater there on the Port.

We have confirmed with Island Grown Co-Op that we will be able to stop by, which will be a great stop since they have finished their facility. So there will be a lot more for you to see and tour. And then we've also confirmed with Westland Whiskey that we will be able to go by their rack houses and look inside and tour what they're working on there as well.

So like I mentioned, it's going to be about from 2:30 to 4:30 is the plan for right now. So what I'm hoping to hear, one, is who knows that they will be able to be there – and I don't know, Chair: would that best (be) by a show of hands or –

Chair Raschko: I think a show of hands.

Ms. Rogers: Who knows they will be able to be there?

Chair Raschko: Who will be there?

Ms. Rogers: One, two – so –

Commissioner Henley: Can you send us this?

Ms. Rogers: Yes, I had just gotten confirmation from Amazon today that they were able to make it, so I'll have a written-up one. The 23rd.

Commissioner Mitchell: It's Tuesday, the 23rd, correct?

Ms. Rogers: Tuesday, the 23rd, starting at 2:30. I know, I apologize, Commissioner Candler, since I know you'll probably be working, but I wasn't sure if you'd be able to make it or not.

Vice Chair Candler: I don't know either. I don't think so. But I do have a question. Did you figure out the logistics in terms of the Open Public Meeting Act?

Ms. Rogers: Yes. So we will not have to have a hybrid option during the meeting. Legal has discussed this quite a bit. So last year we were still under the emergency order under the state so the OPMA rules were *much* different, much more stringent. With the new ones, our legal department is comfortable that we will be okay. People can show up if they'd like to join the tour if they wanted to. We're not required to have, you know, an open Zoom or something as such. Does that make sense? So we will be covered on that. I know that was difficult last year because it was such a last-minute cancellation. So it looks like about seven of you – everyone except for Commissioner Candler.

Vice Chair Candler: I would like to go but I just don't know yet.

Ms. Rogers: Okay, I'll put you down as a possible. Okay.

Commissioner Knutzen: The caveat for me is that morning I would be travelling back home from eastern Washington. I plan on being able to be here by 12 or 1 but if something happens, I can – with that I'll catch you en route.

Ms. Rogers: Okay. Perfect.

Mr. Hart: Oh, that works.

Commissioner Knutzen: And I may just follow in my pickup if I'm late.

Ms. Rogers: Perfect.

Commissioner Knutzen: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Maybe I missed it, but where's the meeting spot?

Ms. Rogers: So it'll be the same location, so 15400 Airport Drive.

Chair Raschko: Okay, we meet there then.

Ms. Rogers: The same spot that we had previously. I tried to keep it as similar as possible to what you were going to do last year. And the agenda I send out – I had just mentioned to Commissioner Knutzen that we had just gotten confirmation that Amazon would not be able to join _____. So I will send out a new agenda within the next week.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Ms. Rogers: With the addresses.

Commissioner Henley: Sounds good.

Commissioner Mitchell: We're not going to be on a shuttle bus together?

Ms. Rogers: That's the next thing. With the OPMA we don't have to have a hybrid option, but they said do not pile more than a few of you in a car together. So we – myself, I can take three people with me. So that's my next question, is, one, can you drive yourself? Or, two, would you be willing to carpool? I mean, it's not very far. These are all very close to one another so we can certainly meet in the same spot and then just caravan – whichever. But I just wanted to see if anyone would like to ride with one of us.

Commissioner Knutzen: We will be meeting at 3 at the Port headquarters there at that address?

Ms. Rogers: 2:30. I backed it up a half-hour just to give us a little bit more time between stops. So the first stop will start at 2:30.

Chair Raschko: Would it work if we just all meet then and people pile into cars in whichever way they wish at that time?

Ms. Rogers: Right. It can be a little unofficial. That's completely fine as long as everyone's comfortable.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Ms. Rogers: We just can't have more than, I think four. Probably four is the max in one vehicle, so no party van. I'm sorry!

Chair Raschko: Okay, is there anything else on the tour?

Mr. Hart: Commissioners? Oh, I'm sorry. The one thing I wanted to mention is Hawkeye Hangars has – there's an amazing story behind the guy that's proposing Hawkeye Hangars out there, so stay tuned.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Okay, well, thank you, Jenn. With that we will move on to our Commissioner Comments and Announcements. Amy, have you anything to share with the rest of us?

Commissioner Hughes: I have nothing.

Chair Raschko: Nothing? Okay.

Commissioner Knutzen: I do have one issue I'd like to address to the PC and staff. The issue is me. I've been serving on boards for over 50 years. I joined this board two years ago. This is the first one where everything is recorded. That's a realization for me. I didn't think anything about it at first but when I'm reading the transcripts six months into it of what I said, everybody's laughing. It's like, I didn't say that. Well, yes, I said that. It's been said that I don't know what I'm going to say until I hear myself say it and that might be true. So the first thing I do when I come here is I write a note for myself: "You are being recorded." It helps, but it's not 100% effective. Evidence – oh, this does not work here, by the way. It hasn't worked all night. Just to let you know. I didn't want to stop you at the time because I figured it might cut into my speaking time. Anyway, I'm watching up here and I saw a screen pop up that surprised me and I said a statement under my breath. Well, it wasn't under my breath enough because Jenn looked at me and laughed and smirked.

(laughter)

Ms. Rogers: I hear you!

Commissioner Knutzen: So I know I have an issue with rambling. I ramble sometimes and my wife says “sometimes?” I’m working on it. This is a throttled-down version of me. You might not believe that but it is. I’ve been told I need to find counselling, but there is no Talkers Anonymous. So I know I have an issue. I’m loving serving on this board. I’ve been on boards over the years. I’ve been in agriculture for 50 years. We’ve got coming up Ag Tourism. Agriculture is dear to my heart, dead to a lot of our hearts. My history of agriculture in Skagit Valley goes back 60 years. My knowledge of what older farmers told me goes back over 100 years. I’m fourth generation. There are farmers here – families that have been in the valley longer than our family has been. I’m anxiously going to be part of this Agritourism. I know where we’ve been. Lots of people know where we’ve been. I want to be part of where we’re going and I get to do that! And I’m retired now so I get to come here. So bear with me if I ramble too much. Just say, Mark.... Anyway, that’s all I have to say. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Can I just comment on that then? I appreciate you a lot, Mark! What I’m just putting in a plug for is that it’s a hard line between trying to stay on track and keep things moving, and let people say a lot of stuff. But what I’m going to get at is the one thing I really appreciate is – and it’s not an ego thing or anything else – but going through the Chair to speak really makes it so much easier for the person running the meeting. And so I appreciate all the cooperation everybody has in that regard.

Anything else for you, Mark?

Commissioner Knutzen: Just go like that. Look at me and go like that and when I see you I’ll stop, okay? And I mean that seriously, because I *know* I ramble.

Chair Raschko: Well, I tell you. My wife tells me I tell way too long of stories. So Vince, have you anything?

Commissioner Henley: I have nothing more.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Jen?

Commissioner Hutchison: I’ll just say, Mark, I’m exited for Ag Tourism as well! There’s nothing else. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: Can I just say I’ve already made a deal that we can cut your mic.

(laughter)

Vice Chair Candler: So I’m not worried.

Commissioner Knutzen: It doesn’t matter. You’re going to hear it!

Vice Chair Candler: I do feel your pain. I remember reading the first transcript from one of my cases – because I’m recorded almost all the time – and I was saying things that weren’t even real words! But don’t worry – you get over it!

Chair Raschko: Well, I have never watched an episode on Channel 12 because I haven't the courage.

(laughter)

Chair Raschko: Kathy, have you anything?

Commissioner Mitchell: It's painful. My husband knows better than to say a word. And for what it's worth, Mark, it doesn't seem like you ramble to us – honestly.

Chair Raschko: Oh, come on!

Commissioner Mitchell: It does *not* seem like you ramble.

Commissioner Knutzen: Okay, remember I don't hear either!

Commissioner Mitchell: I know that.

Commissioner Knutzen: And I'm always doing this. I do have my hearing aids in – really.

Chair Raschko: All right, Joe. What have you got?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, I actually appreciate when you talk about the past and the history because I think it's important to hear a comment or two once in a while about this is what used to be, and this is what I remember. And I appreciated the soil book you had out tonight. It just made me think, you know, there's a lot of good history in this county.

Commissioner Knutzen: I remember a guy telling me once that he remembered when Twin City Food shut down and he called that "history." And I said, That's not history; that's current events.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Hmm, right.

Commissioner Knutzen: I remember when Libby's shut down in 1969. I remember that.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, I appreciate your service on the commission. That's all I've got.

Chair Raschko: I can't remember what I was going to say! But I do want to just make a comment, and it goes back to Joe's conversation about the fire thing. I was involved with forest fire stuff for 40-something years and I think we've been extremely fortunate in this region. But, you know, you go back – I don't know if anybody's heard of the Tillamook Burn, but that was west of Portland between Portland and Tillamook on the coast. And that burned hundreds of thousands of acres and it reburned and reburned. It just wasn't one year. I mean, it kept going and reburning. And it really didn't get all the way back until, you know, the '80s as far as the regrowth goes. And, you know, those kind of conditions can happen here really easily. Then if you look into the fire history – I won't get into that, but that would really be interesting to you – the fire history in the Pacific Northwest going back 500 years. So, you know, that'd be a *really* long story, Mark....

So with that, I call it quits and we'll stand adjourned. Thank you everybody. Good night (gavel).