

**Skagit County Planning Commission  
Deliberations: SMP Update  
October 12, 2021**

**Planning**

**Commissioners:** Kathy Mitchell  
Mark Knutzen  
Vince Henley  
Amy Hughes  
Tim Raschko, Chair  
Joe Woodmansee  
Tammy Candler, Vice Chair  
Martha Rose

**Staff:**

Hal Hart, Planning Director  
Betsy Stevenson, Senior Planner  
Peter Gill, Long Range Planning Manager  
Jennifer Rogers, Long Range Planning Assistant  
Daniel Hasenoehrl, Long Range Planning Intern

**Others:**

Dan Nickel, Consultant (The Watershed Company)

Chair Tim Raschko: Good evening and welcome to the October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2021, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission. We'll start with the roll call. Is Commissioner Candler present?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: So no Commissioner Candler. Commissioner Henley?

Commissioner Vince Henley: I'm here.

Chair Raschko: And Commissioner Hughes?

Commissioner Amy Hughes: Present.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Knutzen, I saw you.

Commissioner Mark Knutzen: I'm here.

Chair Raschko: And Commissioner Mitchell, I saw you as well. And Commissioner Rose, I know you're here. Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Joe Woodmansee: Here.

Chair Raschko: Great. Thank you. Before we begin, there's a new person in the Planning Department. Peter, would you please do an introduction?

Peter Gill: Sure. Thank you, Chair Raschko, and good evening, Planning Commissioners. I'm excited to let you know that we have a new member of our team in long range planning. Her name

is Jennifer Rogers and she's got a good background in legislative matters and public outreach. But I'd like to let her introduce herself just briefly, if that's okay.

Chair Raschko: That is okay.

Jennifer Rogers: Thank you so much. Hi, everyone. I'm Jen Rogers. I live and grew up in Skagit County. I graduated from Burlington-Edison so I'm a local here. I spent the last 3½ years working for Representative Rick Larsen's office as the Skagit, Whatcom, and San Juan community liaison and I had a great time getting to know the stakeholders here in the community. So I'm just really excited to get started and to start working with all of you. Thanks so much.

Chair Raschko: Thank you and welcome. I look forward to meeting in person.

Ms. Rogers: That will be great.

Chair Raschko: Yeah. So would anybody care to make a motion to approve the minutes from our last meeting?

Commissioner Henley: I so move.

Chair Raschko: Is there a second?

Commissioner Kathy Mitchell: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes. Is there discussion of the minutes?

(silence)

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

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Aye. All opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Are there any abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: So the minutes are approved. Thank you. Okay, \_\_ Public Remarks. This time on the agenda is an opportunity for anyone to speak to the Planning Commission about any topic except items that have had a public hearing and are still under Planning Commission deliberation. Public Remarks, which is not part of the formal public participation process for any development regulation or Comprehensive Plan amendment project, is limited to three minutes per speaker and up to 15 minutes total. So is there anybody who is dialed into the meeting from the general public who cares to address the Planning Commission?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: I see no volunteers. With that, we will turn to the Shoreline Master Program Deliberations. This is quite complicated. I'm sure it's confusing. I hope it's confusing for everybody because it is for me! Before we can jump into it, I'd ask: Does anybody have any questions about process or for staff that they would like to ask?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Commissioner Hughes: Tim?

Chair Raschko: Yes?

Commissioner Hughes: This is Amy Hughes. May I ask staff a question?

Chair Raschko: You certainly may.

Commissioner Hughes: Okay. Peter, just so I don't assume anything, the document you sent for us to look at for this deliberations had many different colors and things crossed out and not, and I'm just wanting to make sure that I am understanding that paperwork correctly as we go forward. And so could you review how that works, and maybe even putting it up on the screen so we can watch you as you talk through the different colors, the cross-outs, the highlights? Could you just review those?

Mr. Gill: Sure, I'd be happy to do that.

Commissioner Hughes: Thank you.

Mr. Gill: Let me get it up here and share my screen. Yeah, thank you for the question. So this draft recorded motion was distributed. It was based on the previous recorded motion from 2016 and so some of what you're seeing – those of you who were here in 2016 are seeing it again. What we did, though, is we removed the Findings and the Reason for Action at this point in order to focus on the Planning Commission recommendations, and we'd be working through the Findings at future meetings or later on as we go. And so you won't find much there in the beginning. Jumping down to the Recommendations, you'll see some redline strikeouts and those are items from the 2016 recorded motion that are already resolved with the current draft of the Shoreline Program. They've already been integrated into that document. But I did want to keep it. And I know it looks messy and so I apologize but I did want to keep it so that you all can track and we can track the – kind of the history of what has happened and what has been addressed as it relates to the previous review.

So that is the beginning of the document and I have also tried to provide some notation in the margins as to when the existing recommendation relates to other recommendations, either from the staff or the Department, or it refers back to the Comment Matrix that you all have been reviewing for the last few meetings.

And so the ones that are not, you know, stricken or striked out or red are ones that were from 2016 but have not been addressed by this current draft. As you get further down, we get into new recommendations from the Planning Commission as we have gone through the meetings for the last year or so that have been added in here as drafts. So public access on dikes came up in September and so we've added some statements about that. Water lift craft – or watercraft lift

canopies has come up multiple times – July, August – so we’ve added things like that in here. They also relate to public comments so I’ve tried to note that in the margins where applicable. And then below this little red paragraph here, this is just commentary. These recommendations are from the staff – Department-recommended responses to public comments that we’ve gone over the last few meetings. And so that’s what the remainder of the document is. Item number 21 through 31 are the staff-recommended changes from the Public Comment Matrix.

And what gets confusing a little bit is that there’s overlap between, you know, some of the 2006 (sic) recommendations and what has come up more recently as well. So I tried to notate those things as well.

Did that help everyone or anyone?

Commissioner Hughes: Thank you. That helped me a lot.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Are there any other questions for –

Commissioner Henley: I think Commissioner Candler has her hand up.

Chair Raschko: Yeah, I’d invite everybody to use the Chat Box please. Not everybody – excuse me. The people who are participating in the meeting who wish to have the floor. First of all, thank you and make note that Commissioner Candler is present, and go ahead, please, Tammy.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you. Can everybody hear me?

Mr. Gill: Yes.

Commissioner Henley: Yes.

Vice Chair Candler: I’m having technical issues again. I think it’s the rain. But anyway, I have a question. I’m confused about the document as well and maybe the whole process that we’re using here. I’ve never seen it quite like this before and maybe that’s not an issue, but while we’ve been doing this I was under the impression that some of those “track changes” that are listed as Planning Commission Recommendations in our recorded motion – I thought those were things that the Department was actually recommending based on basically the matrix and some of the other things. And so I’m trying to figure out how this fits into the overall picture. Is the Department making the changes that *they* recommended in the matrix, or is the Department *not* going to make those changes and it’s going to be on the Planning Commission to recommend that to the Board? And I think this is important and the reason, for example – I think it’s present number 25 – the Open Concept Plan has been discussed a lot so it’s a good example. The Planning *Commission* hasn’t fully discussed that yet. The Planning Commission individual members have brought it up but we haven’t discussed it as a whole to figure out what our consensus is going to be. But my understanding was that the Department was willing to add the voluntary language on their own and that that was just going to happen, irrespective of whatever the Planning Department is recommending. So if that makes sense. I’m trying to get some clarity as to what is happening with the *Planning Department’s* version of this document. Does that make sense, for Peter or Betsy or somebody?

Mr. Gill: Yeah. Chair, I can respond to that.

Chair Raschko: Do so.

Mr. Gill: So, yeah, so the Department recommendations that are moving forward as a Department recommendation would have been the ones that were found in the Comment Matrix that we've been working through in response to those public comments. Now I don't know that there was consensus that the Planning Commission also agreed with those recommendations and that's why they're in a *draft* recorded motion. So if there is agreement or there is not – if there is agreement it would stay. If there's not agreement it would be removed. If there's a modification that needs to be made, you know, obviously then there would be a modified by the Planning Commission, and then the Planning Commission's, you know, recorded motion is a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. The previous ones – the ones before the staff recommendation – all the red ones that are crossed out – and maybe I can remove that as we're going through that so people aren't confused – those were already addressed in the current draft. We haven't made actual changes to the document based on the Public Comment Matrix responses.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay, so that's the crux of my question. Are you planning to?

Mr. Gill: I believe I would like to consult Betsy and Dan on that. I don't believe we are actually going to change the document, but Betsy might be able to fill us in – or Dan.

Dan Nickel: I'm happy to, if you want me to, Betsy. I think the plan was not to change the document, that the Planning Commission would have their recorded motion with their recommended changes and then we'd have basically a staff report that identifies recommended changes to the document. But there would not be a new version that goes to the Board.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay, so there wouldn't be a new version. There would be the old version and then there would be a staff report that says what the Planning Department thinks the Board should do on a given topic, and then there would be our recorded motion that says what the Board of County Commission should do on a given topic. Like taking for example the Open Concept Plan. The Department, if I understood correctly, *is* recommending that change and that that would be presumably then in the staff report to the Board of County Commissioners if not changed in draft form. Is that right?

Betsy Stevenson: Yes, that's my understanding too, Tammy.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Stevenson: So then you can decide whether the changes that Peter's outlined in this section that were in, you know, 21 through whatever the last one was, whether you agree with the changes that the staff is proposing or whether you want to do something different than what we're proposing. I think that was his intention to make that work. But I remember us saying that, yes, we would make those changes to the Open Concept Plan under number 25 so that is our intention. But agreeing with what Dan also said, we don't want to change the document. We're just going to say these are the recommended changes that we would make based on the public comment and the discussions and everything, so everybody's clear.

Vice Chair Candler: And is that because you don't want to change the document given that it went to the public in its current form or is there some other reason why you would not change your draft?

Ms. Stevenson: No, just to keep it that way. Yeah, just to keep it the same way that everybody else – the same version all the way through the process.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay, that was one question. I might have another but I can't think of it right now.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, I'm getting my mind wrapped around this a little bit better. So I think it was the April 13<sup>th</sup> version is *the* version that we would base everything on. So if we wanted to go back and do this the long way, we could go through page 1 through 300 or whatever it was, making changes and saying yes, no, yes, no, yes, no, but your intent was using this draft that Peter issued to us on the 8<sup>th</sup> instead. Just speed the process up and just focus on these things now. So the question that I have is: That means that we would tacitly be approving all the other changes that were made that went out to the public as it was, without going back and looking at them again unless somebody thought to bring them up now. Is that correct?

Mr. Gill: This is Peter, Chair. That would be correct. The assumption was that if you – during deliberation if you have an issue with something that's in that current April draft, you should bring it to the table so that we can make sure it gets addressed during deliberation and put into the recorded motion.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay, good. I'm glad that means that we got that clear so people know that if they – surely we're going to have more than one meeting for deliberations the way this looks – then they can bring more to the table the next time if they need to. But then the reminder would be to everybody new and old – because I need to be reminded too – to go back and look through that April 13<sup>th</sup> version that we've gone through ad nauseum, I know – but make sure everything is the way you think it should be or could be, and be ready for it as we come through.

So part B of a question then on this is: Are you expecting to issue us any more staff reports or anything else while we're going through deliberations or do we have everything that you intend to give us now?

Mr. Gill: Yes. So – this is Peter – so there will be a staff report provided prior to the October 28<sup>th</sup> meeting – sorry, I forget what the date of the meeting was. But, yes, there will be a staff report that goes along with it. It will be consistent with what you decide during the Public Comment Matrix review in those recommendations.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay, are you – so when you're saying – I think what I just want to make sure is that if we literally start the deliberation process, which we technically have not done yet, then we would probably just go over the little bits that we're looking at now, because if you bring in more from a staff report, that could change what our ideas, direction, votes on little pieces along the way, and recommendations for findings and facts and reasons could be. Is that correct?

Mr. Gill: It certainly could change. Our recommended changes to the document is not changing. But, yes, there could be findings in that staff report. And remember there was already a staff report – right? – so this is essentially a supplemental staff report to address what our recommended changes are based on those public comments.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay. And what's the timeframe you're expecting that for then for us? The 28<sup>th</sup>, is that what you said?

Mr. Gill: It will be for the meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup> and so it would be the 21<sup>st</sup> to expect it.

Ms. Stevenson: Oh. I'd love to have the extra time, but I think it's the 19<sup>th</sup> and the 26<sup>th</sup> – if we're still meeting on Tuesdays.

Mr. Gill: Oh, sorry. Sorry about that! I had the 28<sup>th</sup> in my head for some reason.

Commissioner Mitchell: What is our next meeting day?

Ms. Stevenson: The 26<sup>th</sup>. So in a perfect world, you'll have those by the 19<sup>th</sup> and I'll do everything in my power to get them to you by then.

Mr. Gill: Yep, the 26<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay, and I've got one more question for you and this is a process question because I don't want to make any mistakes when we launch into deliberations. When we do – I don't know who to ask this of – when we do deliberations, I just want to make sure if we need more information are we free to ask for more information from staff or from somebody that made comments or anything like that? Or is it an all-stop thing from here on out? I'm asking – that's not just for myself but for new people.

Mr. Gill: As far as new information? Yeah, we can – if there are questions, if you want more information on one of your concerns or questions, certainly you can request that.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Kathy. Commissioner Woodmansee, you have the floor.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Thank you. Yep, I'm here. So kind of following up with some of the other questions: So we're going to present the original draft document to the County Commissioners and there's going to be a list of recommended changes from the Planning Commission, and then that's going to be a separate document. And then there's going to be a third document that is, for lack of a better term, a competing list of recommended changes from staff. Is there going to be somewhere in there where there's some sort of report that says – well, I'm assuming that at that point – I'm not sure which one's first, the chicken or the egg, but it seems to me like I like to have the staff's recommendations before I make *my* plan or recommendations so I know *clearly* what they're recommending on everything.

Commissioner Mitchell: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Anyways – which I'm assuming that's what the 19<sup>th</sup> is all about. So I just have a little concern with that we're sending forward a document that we know that we're recommending changes to and those changes aren't integrated into the document. They're actually a separate thing and you've got to say, Okay, number 41 – okay, yeah, the Planning Commission had, you know, a recommended change here. So is the draft document going to be marked up so that the Commissioners can know that, Okay, this item – or are they going to have to compile all that and get it into the same view so that they can realize that, Okay, item number 4 on page 3 is recommended by the Planning Commission to do x, but it doesn't actually say it in the main overall document. It says it somewhere else. I don't know if that made sense what I said, but I just feel like a compiled document's better than three different documents. It's almost like it would be better if there was a, you know, a particular item that had "The Planning Commissioners recommend x," and then right below that it said either staff concurs or they concur but with this minor change, and it was all right there. Maybe that's too much work but....

Mr. Gill: Yeah. No, I think as far as readability and clarity on what the Board sees, I think that would be very helpful.

Commissioner Woodmansee: It would be for me for sure, because now I can – right there – and I'm not, you know, working on this stack of papers and this stack of papers and this stack of papers.

Mr. Gill: Right.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So, anyways, I think that would be helpful – something along that line.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Joe. Commissioner Henley?

Commissioner Henley: Yes, thank you. A question of redundancy. I look at the 2016 recorded motion and if you look at item 2 it talks about the same subject that Commissioner Candler was talking about and that's the public access question. And if you look at item 2 on page 2 of the 2016 document, you'll see that we're deleting that same paragraph that we've asked to be deleted in the past, and that was a version that according to this recorded motion was approved unanimously by the Planning Commission in 2016. So my question is: Why are we bringing it up again in the current document if it's already been dealt with in 2016? Because it seems to me like in 2016 we did what we asked earlier to be done, and that is simply delete that item 4 references (a) and (b) and note new language was added, and I don't think we need new language. But in the 20 – the current document we're talking about here, not only do we delete that item but we add a couple of paragraphs of new verbiage which I think is redundant and not necessary. So my question is: Why are we doing that?

Ms. Stevenson: I should probably take this one because I was the one that was here – if that's okay. Peter, if you want to try to take a stab at it you can, but I don't mind doing it.

Mr. Gill: Yes.

Ms. Stevenson: So this is a situation where your recorded motion got presented to the County Commissioners and that's the one we saw, okay? So in that window in time, your recorded motion was presented to the County Commissioners. That doesn't mean that that was what the staff recommendation was going to be, so when we were working on the new drafts to do, we didn't necessarily pick up all of the changes from the Planning Commission before we brought out the new draft. So that's kind of where we are. This is one of the things that I think Peter mentioned when he put it together. It was something that the Planning Commission at the time wanted to change and it did go before the Board in that way, but that was something that we were also going to talk to them about and why the staff recommended that we retain it. So there may be others besides that one that are similar. There may be other things that were either picked up or not picked up. And I think that's what Peter was alluding to when he kind of went through it and answered Amy's question at the beginning as far as how we did it. But that was one of the ones where we are required to have a public access plan of some sort to get our Shoreline Program adopted, so we felt like this was still the best option for the County.

Commissioner Henley: Well, I don't see that we wouldn't have a physical (sic) access program if we simply deleted that paragraph. It just doesn't make any sense to me. We've got the urban growth public access language and I don't think we need to cover it again in the Shoreline Management Program. I mean, it just doesn't make any sense to me. But we can – we'll have this



debate, I assume, later when we get into deliberations, but I just wanted to see why we have this redundancy going on when it's clearly not needed.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Is there anybody else who wishes to question?

Mr. Gill: Commissioner Mitchell has her hand up.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Commissioner Mitchell, go ahead, please.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, thanks. I just want clarification. Historically, the transmittal would involve the draft document, the Planning Commission's recorded motion and Findings of Fact, an accompanying staff report, and any maps or, you know, ancillary items of that sort – such – to the Board of County Commissioners. Is that what they're going to be seeing or are you doing something different? I'm a little bit confused after the conversations we just had.

Mr. Gill: That sounds very consistent with what we plan to do. We may have to – so we are required to provide them a draft of your recorded motion within two weeks of signature, and so whether we're able to pull all those things together for that first initial distribution to the Board I'm not sure, but eventually we will get all those pieces that you mentioned, Commissioner Mitchell, to the Board prior to their discussion.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay, good. Thank you. And as standard operating procedure from hereon out and since the year you've been here – or two, Peter, now, we will always – all of us will always be issued that transmittal group, correct?

Mr. Gill: Yes, you will definitely get copies as well.

Commissioner Mitchell: And also notified of the meeting date of when the Board will look at it, yeah?

Mr. Gill: You bet.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you so much.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you. There was just one other thing I wanted to bring up. I just can't – this has spread out over such a long period of time that I'm having a little bit of problems remembering exactly what has transpired. But I do recall one of the Commissioners, or a couple of the Commissioners, asking for some certain sort of overlay type maps on the – I think the issue was on the what 10% impervious, you know, would look like on some of these shoreline lots. But I could be wrong about what the issue was, but I was just wondering if – just if any of the other Commissioners still have sort of remaining wishes for that before we move into deliberations. And I saw Peter, you put your hand up, I think.

Mr. Gill: Yeah. Chair, I do have a few slides on this subject as promised previously, if the Commission would like to take a look at those.

Vice Chair Candler: And I would like to look at those just like prior to our starting of actual discussion. Right now I know we're just doing questions, but thank you, Peter. I appreciate that.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So this is just actually a point of clarification. So, Peter, did you say that you're going to get the document to the Commissioners and you may or may not get the Planning Commission comments to them the first time they see the document?

Mr. Gill: No. No, actually I didn't. I said we are required to get the recorded motion from the Planning Commission to the Board within two weeks of it being signed. And so whether we can compile all of the changes into a document and get a staff memo to the Board all written up to describe everything that's happened over the last year plus is the part that I wasn't sure if we're going to be able to get all of it in in that two weeks or if we're going to have to get the recorded motion to them initially and then follow up with the memos and everything else.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay, so I actually heard it backwards. So yes, I'm all right. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Joe. Anybody else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, then we'll go ahead and start deliberations. What I propose to do would be take it in three **tranches**, if you will. First I think it would be good to consider recommendations that are originated by members of the Planning Commission. Following that, we go through the original 2016 recorded motion via the recent recorded motion, so that would be items 1 through 20. And then following that, take on the items in the recorded motion that were originated by public comment.

Does anybody have any problem with that scenario?

Vice Chair Candler: Yes.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead, Commissioner Candler.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you. I was just hoping that *before* we do that we could see what Peter brought us as far as slides.

Chair Raschko: Oh, I thought we were going to do that when we got to that issue. That's great. Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: I was hoping we would do it before.

Chair Raschko: Let's do it before.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you.

Mr. Gill: Okay, I can do that. I'm all teed up. Here we go. There we go. All right. So this slide, this is based on the question about the 10% hard surface or impervious surface cover on newly created lots within the Rural Conservancy shoreline environment designation. This has to do with the table, Table 14.26.310-1 in the Shoreline Program. And that is showing the Rural Conservancy at 30% for existing lots. The proposal is to change that to 10% for newly created

lots with residential – where the use is residential. So to get to our conceptual example here, we've got a lake over here. Can you all see my cursor, just so I know?

Chair Raschko: Yes.

Mr. Gill: Okay, good. So here's the ordinary high water mark of the lake. Here's 200 feet – this blue dashed line. It's shoreline jurisdiction. We've got a shoreline buffer on a lake at 150 feet, so that's the black line. The square here is a 3½-acre parcel. The black boxes are building footprints. The gray is a patio – poured concrete, let's say. And a path down to the – down toward the lake. In this example, we've got a new lot that was created. It's 3½ acres. You've got 24,000 square feet of that lot within shoreline designation – or shoreline jurisdiction, I should say. The building footprint that's within shoreline jurisdiction – so waterward of that blue hatched line. The building footprint is 1800 square feet in shoreline jurisdiction. The path here and the patio is another 500 square feet. The total is 2300 square feet and that is approximately 9% of the 24,000 square feet within shoreline jurisdiction. So that's how you get to that. Just below 10,000 – or 10%, I should say – 10% impervious or hard surface within shoreline jurisdiction. This is a sample house. This is a barn outside of shoreline jurisdiction, et cetera.

Another example. Sometimes it's helpful to look at real world examples because there was conversation about real small lots being created within shoreline jurisdiction. And the only real way that could happen is if there's a subdivision, a CaRD subdivision where you can create lots less than one acre. Right? However, part of the provisions for these CaRD subdivisions is that no building lots shall be located in critical areas and their buffers. And so what you'll see in this real world example is when they carved out the smaller-than-acre building areas or lots, they did them outside of shoreline jurisdiction. So you see the blue dash line? That is the critical areas buffer. And they put the building sites outside of that buffer – right? – because that's part of the requirement of a CaRD subdivision.

This is one example on Nookachamps Creek. Another one on Colony Creek. You'll see the blue-dashed line is the protected buffer area. There's a couple of them on this. The building lots or newly created lots are well away from those area. They're shown in yellow there. So those real small lots within shoreline jurisdiction, as far as newly created, would not actually happen within that buffer area. I thought it would be even more useful to say okay, well, even maybe there is some way that that could happen, so here's an example from an aerial photo in our area and it shows impervious surface area on each of these lots, A, B, C, D, and E. Starting from the left you've got a very small footprint within that shoreline jurisdiction. It's like 1% of that lot. On B you've got more of a normal size home. It's roughly 3100 square feet if you include the driveway and the walkway and the house, and that comes out to between 9 and 10% impervious – or hard surface, I should say. C is similar. C is about 9 to 10%. Again we're looking at the building – only the building within waterward of the blue line, which is the shoreline jurisdiction. And I've outlined the buildings that count, or the portion of the building that counts, in yellow. This is not the building. This is actually the driveway parking area outside the garage. On D, now you're getting above that 10% impervious or hard surface. You've got a full tennis court, large patio, part of the house within that jurisdiction. We're looking at 22% of that lot. And then E, where you've got even more extreme. You've got a house – a couple of houses or maybe an ADU, and quite a bit of roads, and it's hard to tell exactly what's going on there. Maybe that's going to be seeded and maybe they're still in construction. But that's like 90% of that lot is hard surface.

So that's on the ground today. That's what's going on. Just an example of what different levels of impervious look like on the ground within shoreline jurisdiction. Hopefully that's helpful and not confusing.

Vice Chair Candler: I found that to be incredibly helpful. Thank you.

Mr. Gill: Great.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Commissioner Hughes.

Commissioner Hughes: Thank you. It was answered so I'm done.

Chair Raschko: Oh, great. All right, would anybody else like the floor?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Commissioner Mitchell.

Chair Raschko: Oh. Commissioner Mitchell, are you wanting the floor?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes sir, if it's okay.

Chair Raschko: Sure.

Commissioner Mitchell: Since we're still technically not started yet I've got a question for Betsy – just generically. A couple of times in the last few months – I cannot remember when without checking transcripts – I had asked if you could touch base with the dike and drainage and farmer people and those kinds of things to see if they were up to speed. And do you think we'll be hearing anything more or are we stopped with what we have now?

Ms. Stevenson: Oh, I have talked to Jenna from the drainage district consortium and she was able to explain some of the comments in her letter and we had the conversation, and so we're looking at potential recommended changes from staff based on that conversation. That *may* take care of the issues that they raise in their letter, in their comment letter. Some of their questions were mapping questions so I was going to put her in touch with Dan and I haven't had a chance to do that yet because we just met on Friday to talk about it. But I think that we can come to some agreement on some of the things that they're asking for and include some of maybe not exactly the language that they're looking for but identify some – it made it more clear to me what they were asking for when she said something about being part of the recital and including that. So I think we – I think there were three items that we were going to work on and get back together and touch base on. And I was feeling pretty comfortable at the end of the conversation – that we had made some headway and it seemed as though it was agreeable and that might work. So there may be some things that come out of my staff report and recommendation for an additional couple of edits if we can get there and work that out.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay, that's exactly what I was going to say. Was it going to be something that was totally between you and them from here on out away from us, or would something be coming back? So it's possible something might come back.

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah. They know what our deadline is so she and I will probably be talking again very shortly so that I can have it incorporated into the staff findings and staff report, and maybe a couple recommended text changes for you guys to consider too.

Commissioner Mitchell: Well, thank you. I really appreciate the work to do follow-up.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Have I missed anybody else?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a question for Peter.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead please, Joe.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Peter, on your last slide that blue line – was that – what was the distance from shoreline to that blue line?

Mr. Gill: That was 200 feet.

Commissioner Woodmansee: 200?

Mr. Gill: Yeah. I mean, it's roughed out because we're measuring on aerial photos.

Commissioner Woodmansee: *Assumed* to be 200 feet.

Mr. Gill: Yes.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. I just wanted to double-check and verify. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. All right, last changes for anybody else.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Well, let's let the process begin then. As I said before, my proposal is to first talk about initiatives by members of the Planning Commission. And we did receive a document from Commissioner Henley. And I know I didn't ask you in advance, but, Commissioner Henley, would you please lead a discussion on your proposals?

Commissioner Henley: Of course. There are three proposals. You've all been given copies of them. You've probably read them. I don't know whether you have or not but, in fact, you have had the ability to read them.

The first one is the same subject that we've just talked about briefly with Commissioner Candler and with Betsy Stevenson, and that is having to do with defining public access for the Shoreline Management Program. We've recommended consistently that the paragraph on the Public Access Plan simply be deleted, and that's consistent with what happened in the 2016 document as well. We don't need to have that there. We've got the Skagit Countywide Urban Growth Area Open Space Concept Plan which covers this. I don't think we need to have another one in the Shoreline Management Program. So I would suggest that we go back to our original request and simply delete that one paragraph – actually two parts of that one paragraph – from the Shoreline Management Program. And I would be happy with that, and I do see that in the draft on page 2, item 2, we do delete that particular paragraph, *but* when we get down to item 25 what we do is we add a lot of bureaucratic language back into it and I'm not sure that we need that. So I'd like to see that part of it dropped and simply remove those paragraphs from the SMP.

Chair Raschko: Do you care to put that in the form of a motion?

Commissioner Henley: I would if it's appropriate, yes.

Chair Raschko: Is it appropriate?

Commissioner Henley: Well, I don't know we would – I don't know who we would ask that question of, but yes, I will move that, in fact, we delete those paragraphs from the SMP.

Commissioner Mitchell: I'd like to second that. This is Mitchell.

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's been moved and seconded to remove the aforementioned paragraphs from the – what did I call it? – draft recorded motion. Is there discussion?

Vice Chair Candler: Yes.

Chair Raschko: Who have we got? Commissioner Candler.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you. So we can't do that, I think. What we can do is we can move – we can *recommend* that the Board of County Commissioners direct the Department to do that and that that be the plan, and I think maybe I'm just – maybe I'm telling you something you already know, but it seems like maybe – if you don't, I'd like to explain it. We can't change the document itself. We can only make our recommendations and we can make – so you said something like Who do we make that motion to? The motion you'd be making is to your fellow Planning Commissioners to agree with you or not that that is the language that we want the Board of County Commissioners to adopt, and that we want it in our recorded motion that we agree that it should be out. Does that make sense?

Chair Raschko: Well, that was what I was trying to say. \_\_\_\_\_ in the recorded motion.

Vice Chair Candler: I just didn't –

Commissioner Henley: It does make sense to me, and with the agreement of the second I will be happy to modify my motion.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you. I'm sorry. I wasn't trying to overexplain things if you already know it. It's just that you said, Who would I make that motion to? So I just wanted to try to help if I can.

Commissioner Henley: No, I appreciate it and I think that's a good idea. What I'm trying to do is come to a consensus of the recommendation from the Planning Commission to the Board of Commissioners, and the recommendation I would like to make is that that particular paragraph be deleted.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes, I'm sorry. I probably didn't listen to the motion carefully enough. I assumed that his motion was for us to include this in our recommendations and our findings of facts and reasons document.

Chair Raschko: Correct. Okay. Mr. Gill, have you got the proposed motion – or the motion, I should say? Have you got that down yet?

Mr. Gill: Well, \_\_\_\_\_. What I have is to – a motion to delete Skagit 14.26.370-4 regarding Shoreline Public Access Plan.

Chair Raschko: And Commissioner Henley, did you also mention farther down in the draft recorded motion another –

Commissioner Henley: Yes, item 25.

Chair Raschko: Item 25 as well.

Commissioner Henley: Yes, I'd like to delete item 25.

Mr. Gill: Okay. And the motion includes removing from the recorded motion item number 25, which is the Department recommendation.

Commissioner Henley: Yes.

Mr. Gill: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Is there further discussion? Commissioner Hughes?

Commissioner Hughes: I would like clarification that I'm understanding this. In the motion, it looks like we're deleting both the UGA Open Space Concept Plan and the Skagit 2020 Comprehensive Parks and Rec Plan. Are we keeping the Park and Rec's Plan still viable?

Commissioner Henley: We don't need any part of that for the SMP. It's already covered in the Open Space Plan for the UGA.

Commissioner Hughes: I need some elaboration on that, I guess.

Commissioner Henley: Well, what staff tried to do was try to bring language which makes the Open Space Plan part of the UGA into language in the SMP, and my position is is that we don't need to do that. We can simply delete the references to an Open Space Plan in the SMP and rely on the Skagit County UGA Open Space Plan to cover the same material, so to speak. It's redundant, is what I'm trying to say.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Anything else, Amy?

Commissioner Hughes: I guess I'm still trying to track if that would then include the Skagit County 2020 Comprehensive Parks and Rec Plan and what others feel about that plan, because I believe that went through a process. Is that part of the Open Space Plan? Where does that fit in the documents?

Commissioner Henley: Well, it doesn't fit in the SMP that I'm trying to modify. There's no mention of it at all.

Commissioner Hughes: Yes, and I understand that. Does anyone else have comment regarding having an already-approved plan as part of this process and how that fits? Or am I tracking a conversation that no one else is having?

Chair Raschko: Would it be helpful for staff to explain why it is in there?

Vice Chair Candler: Yes. If possible, yes, and how it affects Parks and Rec.

Mr. Gill: Betsy, do you want to take that?

Ms. Stevenson: Sure. I was just waiting to be recognized by the Chair.

Chair Raschko: Oh, I'm sorry.

Ms. Stevenson: I don't want to start jumping into this –

Chair Raschko: Go ahead, please.

Ms. Stevenson: – without you guys telling us. It's going to be confusing enough so I'm going to wait to be recognized, if that's okay. So part of what we're required to do with our Shoreline Master Program Update is to provide a shoreline access plan. So we can either start from scratch and develop and prepare a shoreline access plan or we can refer to documents that are already adopted and have already gone through a public process and identify those as these are still valid and good and these are the same – we share the same goals as those outlined in both of those plans, and when necessary to refer to a shoreline access plan for guidance, those are the documents that we would go to. So that's why they're in there.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Commissioner Rose?

Commissioner Martha Rose: Yes. Thank you, Betsy, for clarifying that. I guess my point was going to be I'm not sure I understand why a little redundancy is a problem. It seems like it could be missed if it wasn't in there – if somebody was applying for a permit where that came into play if it wasn't stated, maybe it would be not missed. But I guess I'm not finding a problem with the redundancy, and I think, Betsy, you have explained it very well. So at any rate, I just wanted to state that for the record.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Candler: So for members of the public who have expressed concerns to me about this, I have been more along the lines of: This is a concept plan, not an adopted plan. It hasn't been through process, isn't – you know, is a voluntary. They're concerned about it sort of expanding and eking into a – either a non-voluntary program or a – basically affecting their property rights. And I still don't know about Commissioner Hughes's question. I don't know if what – I'd have to look more carefully to see if what's left of Parks and Rec if we do that or how it's affected at all. I didn't think it was and if I'm wrong I may have to rethink it. For the reasons that have been expressed to me, I would support the motion.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you. I don't have a problem with and I've not had a problem with all along the part with the Parks and Recreation Plan being included. The part I have the problem with is the UGA Open Space Concept Plan being included. That's my objection and that's what I would like to see removed. Thank you.

Commissioner Henley: That was the intention of the motion – was to remove that part.

Chair Raschko: Okay, any more comments or questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, so discussion is over. The motion is to remove those two sections from the draft recorded motion. All those in favor, say "aye."



Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Let's see. Is there a way to have a show of hands? All right, okay, we're going to do this by roll call. All right. Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Candler: Aye

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Henley?

Commissioner Henley: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Hughes?

Commissioner Hughes: Abstain.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Knutzen?

Commissioner Knutzen: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Rose?

Commissioner Rose: Nay.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Aye.

Chair Raschko: And I vote aye. So that passes. Thank you. So we'll move on. Commissioner Henley, if you would kindly go to your next point.

Commissioner Henley: Thank you, Chair. The next point also has to do with public access. And the problem with it is – and I'm talking about paragraph 14.26.370-3(c) and 4. It reads as follows: "The maintenance of a public access facility must be the responsibility of the owner or homeowners' association unless otherwise accepted by a public or nonprofit agency through a formal agreement recorded with the Auditor." And it seems to me to be excessively onerous given that the preceding paragraphs public access is obtained involuntarily from the owner in exchange for the permitted use of his property. And then you require the owner to maintain the public access at his uncompensated expense, and it seems to me that's adding sort of insult to injury where you're even more restricting the use of a landowner's property. And my suggestion was – and this isn't necessarily cast in stone – was that the maintenance of the public access facility be the responsibility of the legal entity in whose favor the public access is recorded by instrument, such as an easement or a dedication on the face of the plat. And so what I'm trying to do is ensure that an owner who has been either forced to or has voluntarily granted public access through his property that he doesn't also get impacted by the expense of having to maintain that access. I think that ought to be the responsibility of the County. It ought to be part of the County budget process.

Chair Raschko: Would you care to make a motion to that effect?

Commissioner Henley: Hmm, I hadn't really thought about that because of the fact that I think there's a variety of different words that you could use to do that. But what I'm really trying to say is I would like to have the recorded motion show that the maintenance of the public access is not the financial responsibility of the landowner. We can – if you want to, temporarily we can use the wording that I suggested, but it's only one possible suggestion.

Chair Raschko: Is there discussion?

(silence)

Vice Chair Candler: I'll second for purposes of discussion.

Chair Raschko: You didn't make a motion, did you, Commissioner Henley?

Commissioner Henley: I did.

Chair Raschko: You did? I'm sorry. Okay, it's been moved and seconded to – Peter, do you mind reading back the motion?

Mr. Gill: Sure. The motion was that the recorded motion should show that maintenance of public access should not be the responsibility of the landowner.

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's been moved and seconded. Is there discussion? Let's see, I believe – Commissioner Woodmansee, do you want the floor?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Sure. I don't know that I was first, but I'll take it. So I can tell you a real life experience where I was involved in a project that was required to have an amenity in their project, which was a trail. And it was in a private subdivision that had public roads in the subdivision but the trail was an amenity to the project itself. And the City that was regulating it required that that particular trail be open to the general public; not just the people that lived in that community but anybody who wanted to use that trail could use it. And at the same time the maintenance of that trail was stuck with the x-amount of homes that actually lived in the community, but it was for the benefit of the entire community at large. In a situation like that, I believe that that's exactly what we're trying to avoid here where the County requires public access to an open space and then also requires the owner of that property to provide maintenance for it for the duration of the use of it. And so because I've experienced this exact thing, I would support – I believe that if something's going to be open to the public and it's going to be meant to be used by the entire public and not a private amenity in a particular project, that that should be maintained and taken care of by the public, which ultimately is the entity – the City, the County, whatever – let's go generic here. I guess we're talking about Skagit County though. But if we're requiring somebody to provide something that exceeds just their use and the use of their parcels, it should be maintained by the County, which would, I believe, be in line with what's being proposed here.

Commissioner Henley: It is, yes.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Rose?

Commissioner Rose: Joe, thank you for that example. I was going to ask for an example of what that might look like. But I do have a question and the question is – or the comment is: City

sidewalks out in front of people's homes are accessible by everybody but the homeowner's responsible for maintaining it. So I want to know how this type of thing is different from that. In other words, the land in front of a homeowner's property or business owner – the sidewalk and the street trees – are always maintained by the owner of the property, not the City. So I want to know how this proposal or how this situation would be different than that. And maybe staff could answer that question.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I'd take a stab at it.

Chair Raschko: Please do so.

Commissioner Woodmansee: The first thought that comes to my mind is two wrongs don't make a right. In most of the case, those sidewalks are in a public right-of-way. They're not on the property owner's property. But I understand what the law says – that the homeowner's responsible. A lot of Cities, and some in Skagit County, do a participation thing where the homeowner, if they remove a bad sidewalk the City will repour it. And so it's being kind of pushed into more of a partnership. I've certainly never thought it was okay to make a property owner who has a sidewalk in and on property in front of their house that *they do not own* that somehow they're responsible to maintain it. It makes no sense to me at all. They didn't – you know, to me it falls back to that. If the City or County's going to require a sidewalk and it's in the right-of-way, at that point they control it and *they* should be the ones who maintain it. I've never thought that that was right. So to be clear, though, this is – what you're describing 90% of the time is a sidewalk is *not* on the property owner's property. It's outside of their property but it fronts their property side or front. So my initial reaction is that just because one thing doesn't make sense doesn't mean we do it again.

Chair Raschko: I would agree with that assessment and I can give another example. It's not access trails, but living in a place where you had to have street trees, sidewalks and a parking strip, both owned by the City, but the way the plat was written up, the homeowner's responsible but you had to plant from a certain list of trees, which the developer did. And these trees die after about five years but we have to have the same trees and we have to replace them. And then to get a sizable tree like that, it's about \$1500 getting somebody to plant it. And there's trees dying everywhere. And I just don't think that that's appropriate that the City can make a mandate – or any government can make a mandate like that and then the homeowner is required to try to fulfill it, as fruitless as it seems to be. And because that was written into a plat, I don't believe that that forms a – what's the word I'm looking for? It should not be an indication that every government should impose similar types of requirements, and in my mind that includes maintenance of trails built for the public good. I don't know if that made any sense. Commissioner Mitchell, you had a comment?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes, thank you. I was going to offer some more examples but that would be a waste of time at this point. I've seen problems with the same thing and it's – the same kind of thing and it's not right. Imposing penalties on homeowners across their properties and expecting them to pay for somebody else's use of it is just flat-out wrong, no matter how beautiful and enjoyable it is. So I agree with the motion.

Chair Raschko: And we have Commissioner Henley.

Commissioner Henley: Yes. Maybe I'm oversimplifying this, but it seems to me that the way I had it worded in the document that you're looking at makes it fairly clear. If you have a legal instrument – say an easement or, you know, a note on the plat, for example – and you have a legal entity

who is – in whose favor this access or easement is listed, it seems to me that the responsibility for maintenance should fall on that legal entity whoever it is. And if it's the County it ought to be part of the County budgeting process. Now that may be an oversimplification but that's what I would prefer to see as opposed to having the landowner burdened with uncompensated maintenance for a piece of property that he's lost the use of basically.

Chair Raschko: Okay. I think we've covered this adequately, unless anybody else is dying to make another comment.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, seeing none we'll go for a vote. Would you kindly reread the motion one more time, Mr. Gill?

Mr. Gill: Sure. The motion was to add to the recorded motion, or let the recorded motion show that maintenance of public access should not be the responsibility of the landowner.

Chair Raschko: Okay, we're going to go for a roll call vote again. Commissioner Candler, how do you vote?

Vice Chair Candler: Aye.

Chair Raschko: And Commissioner Henley?

Commissioner Henley: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Hughes?

Commissioner Hughes: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Knutzen?

Commissioner Knutzen: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Rose?

Commissioner Rose: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Aye.

Chair Raschko: And I vote aye so that passes unanimously. Thank you very much. Commissioner Henley, your next point?

Commissioner Henley: Yes, the next one is more a bit of a far-range planning thing. You may recall that in the past I asked a question about why we were excluding the possibility of floating

homes as part of the SMP. And I was told at the time that that had been preempted by the State legislature, and I later did the research and found out that it, in fact, was *not* prohibited by the State legislature. It was merely suggested that it wasn't the best use. Now what I'm trying to do here is – and I've known that the County Commissioners have often expressed that housing is a major problem in Skagit County and especially when considered in terms of its future growth. So I've lived in Europe quite a long time and I've seen that these floating homes – or as they might be called, houseboats – can be an important part of the housing equation in terms of availability and so on. And they don't have to be junky. I mean, in Europe they're highly regulated. They're actually quite beautiful in most places, and in the countries I've lived in where they're quite common. So I was curious enough to look into this and see why we couldn't modify the SMP in such a way that we allowed for the *possibility* of future houseboats, overwater residences – however you want to describe them. And I thought if we could make a modification to the SMP in such a way that should that kind of housing become possible and properly regulated and properly supported in the future, we wouldn't have to go back and change the SMP. So I made a proposal to make some changes throughout the SMP which permits the possibility of floating residences in the future. And I'm talking about ones that are properly regulated where they can be properly sited, designed, supported, and connected to infrastructure such as access power, water, and waste disposal. What I'm trying to do is not artificially restrict housing of any sort. What I'm trying to do is to make sure we have the widest possibility for housing choices in the future without having to go back and modify something where it could have been taken care of in the beginning. So that's the purpose of this document here. And I would like to move that we modify the SMP or suggest a modification to the SMP in such a way that we allow the *future* possibility of floating residences.

Commissioner Mitchell: I'd like to second that motion.

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's – did you get that down, Peter?

Mr. Gill: It would be helpful to probably restate that.

Chair Raschko: Would you please restate it, Commissioner Henley?

Commissioner Henley: What I would like to do is allow the possibility in the SMP for the future implementation of floating residences. In other words, I do not want the SMP to prohibit floating residences, and it currently does that.

Chair Raschko: Yeah, I have a quick question. There's two descriptions: floating and over-the-water. I'm assuming over-the-water means something built over the water on piling, a permanent structure. Is that correct?

Commissioner Henley: Not necessarily, but I think that there are things that could be partially onshore and partially over the water. I'm really more concerned about floating residences. In other words, houseboats that can be moved from site to site and remain in the water. But the SMP currently talks about over-the-water residential uses. So I'm just – what I'm doing is just keying on the language that's already there.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So it's been moved and seconded. Is there discussion? Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Candler: I understand the way that you're putting this motion forward is that you're just not trying to preclude potential options at some future point, and I can respect that. But I want

to know specifically if you believe that there is such a location in Skagit County that would be appropriate for this use, and what would that be?

Commissioner Henley: Well, in Europe these residences are often found in canals. They're found in rivers. They're found in estuaries. They're found in many different places. And I would suggest that we've got a pretty big delta of the Skagit River. I would be surprised to find that we didn't have places in Skagit County where it might be appropriate. Now I don't think this is going to be a huge impact on the housing market or the housing availability in Skagit County, but I just don't want to cut us off from all forms of housing unnecessarily. I think we should have the greatest possible flexibility in housing that we can achieve.

Vice Chair Candler: So what I heard was – as far as an answer to my question – the Skagit River delta as a potential location where you would identify that would be appropriate for this.

Commissioner Henley: That's one place. I can think of several areas in the Salish Sea or Puget Sound, if you call it, as well.

Chair Raschko: Anything else, Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Candler: I guess my only thing is would we want to open this up for the Department maybe to comment, because I think there actually have been some move, you know, to restrict further – and I'm sure that Commissioner Henley's not onboard with that – but has there been some legislation or something that is directing that departments' move, or is that just on the departments themselves, or am I misunderstanding what direction that's going? Could Betsy or somebody weigh in on that?

Commissioner Henley: I'm not aware of any current legislation. I am aware of enabling legislation in the legislature and the City of Seattle has modified its municipal code to be more restrictive than we would probably want to have. But as far as I can tell, the legislature, even given the chance to do so, did not outright prohibit floating homes. They just said it wasn't the best use. Makes a big difference.

Vice Chair Candler: Mm-hmm. No, I appreciate that. I was just wondering if the Department had a position.

Commissioner Henley: I don't know the answer to that question. The staff is here. They can answer it.

Chair Raschko: Mr. Gill?

Mr. Gill: Would you like us to address?

Chair Raschko: Please do so.

Mr. Gill: There is a WAC, 173-26-241, on Shoreline Uses that does state that "new overwater residences including floating homes are not a preferred use and should be prohibited." So there is some WAC – some rules out there that do push us toward prohibiting. That said, you all can make your own recommendation and if – you know, and that can go forward. The Board can take that up if they like. Betsy or Dan may have more to say about that.

Ms. Stevenson: I'd just like to add to answer some of Tammy's – which I think she already probably knows – but given the opportunity, we don't have the infrastructure in place anywhere in Skagit County. There may be something with the Cities that they may have some adjoining shorelines where it might be a possibility if they so chose. But we don't have sewers. We don't have water systems. So I just don't see it based on the trend going the other direction. In the estuaries, in our what you're calling canals – those are drainage ditches in Skagit County and those are operated and run by the special purpose districts here so that's not really something that I see working. The river, we really don't want to put things in our Skagit River that people are living in. It floods too often. You're putting people in harm's way. The Salish Sea and Puget Sound, now all of a sudden you're going to have to put up some protections for those homes that are going out there from wave and, you know, wave action and tidal activity and things that are happening. So to answer Tammy's question, I'm open to somebody telling me but I don't see any of our shoreline areas that are really conducive to such use.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you, Betsy. And I'll just follow up with that. My personal experience, very limited as it may be, was I knew somebody who was trying to live on a boat for a while and they would regularly become so nauseous during storms that they had to rent hotels – as far as in a marina. I do think the river flooding is a problem. I do think that if we tried to put houseboats on lakes they would interfere with – it would be competing use and maybe interfere with some other uses. And I agree that the infrastructure's not there. So I think we're a long ways off from this being viable. Those are my thoughts.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Hughes?

Commissioner Hughes: Thank you. While I can appreciate the out-of-the-box thinking that goes with this, I don't think we've gone through the public process to bring this forward. The Shoreline Management Plan needs to be updated periodically and I feel that we need better vetting before this becomes viable. Since the 1960s Skagit has been on a quest to preserve the rural nature of our county. This is an urban development. The Cities have not been brought into this conversation if there's places of – like I'm thinking of marinas in Anacortes or La Conner. We haven't had their input. We're now 60 years later from our vision for Skagit County to maintain its rural, and with being between two international cities 60 miles to the north and to the south we have a lot of stresses, and I feel that urban growth needs to stay in the urban growth areas. And that would be why at this point I don't see this as viable.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Commissioner Rose.

Commissioner Rose: Commissioner Hughes did a good job of expressing my concerns as well in that for the infrastructure to support that type of thing it would be – it would be like urban growth. It would be not keeping the rural character. And for a one-off here, one-off there the infrastructure's not there, so I can't see that happening. There's this one statement here that says "liveaboards in a marina having adequate facilities may be allowed," and I'm presuming there might be marinas here and there, maybe not in Skagit County but Bellingham or Seattle or Everett, that might allow liveaboard homes. I mean boats. Is that true?

(silence)

Commissioner Rose: But any rate, I guess I'm with Commissioner Hughes in that I don't think that it's the right time or the right place, and Commissioner Candler also spoke to my thoughts. So I'm just dittoing what they have already expressed.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes, thank you. I'm taking a different tack and thought process on this. I've also seen how the liveaboards are done in Europe and the possibilities that are there. And we keep talking about housing crisis out the wazoo for about a decade or more, now lately on a higher volume. And the concept and use and approval of ADUs is growing and the small homes, which really are like little – oftentimes little houses on wheels, which – you know, I was joking with a millennial who was telling me that this is all brand new and I'm saying, Hey, you don't remember the little Streamline silver – I mean, and gypsies for decades and centuries! And, you know, we've had our wagons and ways to do this for hundreds and hundreds of years, and this is just another possibility to allow people to do that. And I do not see the harm or the problem with keeping that option open for somewhere in the future. If we absolutely shut it down now and say there's no way to do it then, hey, close the door on everything else too. So I'm looking at it more as an optimistic thing for the future. There's different ways to do things. Times change. We may be looking for other ways for people to be able to do things. And as for the exact locations where somebody will be or make it viable where to go, who knows? The amounts of shoreline between freshwater and saltwater are just almost – well, I know Betsy actually has the numbers! Unless we, you know, do the whole Salish Sea. But there's a lot of option and potential here, and so rather than saying "can't do" I would rather say "we *could* do" and leave the door open for the possibility to be able to do that. If this were to take off and go off in the future, then it's there to start going on and for people to be reminded that it's a possibility. Thanks.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Candler: There's one more point I forgot to raise. We're presently sort of engaged in a separate discussion in disagreement with the Department about whether or not the canopies on the boats should be see – you know, whatever the word is. Not "see-through," but you know what I mean. And so I feel like things are – and I don't necessarily support that but it just seems like a strange situation to be in. I know living maybe is considered more important to people than just, like, recreational boating, but we're at a situation where it just seems like those things would be really contrary. We're adding boating over water while also, you know, reducing the size of docks and making things let light through and – I don't know. I just wanted to throw that out there.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Everybody's had a chance to speak so I have a comment to make before we start the rounds again. And just in reference to the comments made on infrastructure, if you've ever been to Ross Lake Resort, which is in Whatcom County, it must have 15, 16 floating buildings and it's all serviced by a self-contained septic system that is pumped out into septic trucks on a regular basis by barge. They have their own water supply and they're also able to adjust to the height of the lake, which goes up and down over 100 feet every year. So I don't see that necessarily as a problem. It's just an example of where it isn't. So, Commissioner Henley, you have the floor.

Commissioner Henley: Yes, I'd just like read one part of the recommendation that I had. It's in front of you. And I'm willing to concede that this is not a today problem. What I'm trying to do is to look very far in the future to things that might happen tomorrow. But here are the sentences that describe what I'm trying to do:

I recommend that Skagit County SMP allow for the future possibility of floating homes when they can be properly sited, designed, supported, regulated, and connected to appropriate infrastructure such as access, power, water, and waste



disposal. Let us not artificially restrict housing of any sort. I recommend the following changes to the draft SMP to support this concept.

In other words, I'm trying to look at things that we might see 20 years in the future and I'd like to consider this as a *future* possibility. It's not a today problem. I've never thought it was a today problem but I know how these things get lost and fall between the cracks. I'd like to make sure that we can have a flexible enough SMP that if it comes up or if technology changes things very rapidly we will be prepared to take advantage of it and increase our housing.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Anybody else?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a comment.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell and then Commissioner Woodmansee. Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, thank you. If this recommendation passes to be added in here in language some way or another, I would recommend that that sentence that Mr. Henley just read to us be part of that, because that clarifies more, I think, of what he was saying than we did with the motion before. You know, if it was added on to whatever that statement was. Thanks.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So I came into it tonight thinking that I think that I was all fine with this recommendation, and I'm still fine with the concept of – I don't like the word "prohibited" when it comes to this type of use. It seems to be narrow-channeled, indefinite, and, you know, clearly it's a much tougher obstacle to overcome in the future if you're trying to eliminate the word "prohibited" versus maybe the word is "discouraged," or something like that. I do think that technology exists and can change that can make it more viable. For sure it can change. We see that all the time. And so my issue is the "prohibited" language. I don't think that – I just think that it's short-sighted. And do I think that anybody could ever get overwater homes approved on the Skagit River? No. Not in my lifetime, not in my son's lifetime, not in my grandchildren's lifetime. I just don't see that happening. But it could happen somewhere else. And so my main thing is I support the concept of getting rid of the "prohibited." So for me if my choice is leave the word "prohibited" or support this motion, I would support the motion. I think we're light years away from ever figuring out how to make it happen in Skagit County, but at least that light year opportunity is there and we don't have to overcome the well-this-has-been-prohibited-for-four-years. So four years from now we still can't change it even though maybe there are viable options out there. And so that's kind of where I'm at on it. So I came thinking I'll support it. I listened to everybody's comments and I thought, Oh, maybe I *won't* support it! But where I come back around to is I'd like to lose the "prohibited" part and if the only way to do that is to support this then I would support it.

Chair Raschko: \_\_\_\_\_ the WAC that was quoted used the words "should be prohibited," as I recall.

Commissioner Henley: That's correct.

Chair Raschko: And so that is not a prohibition. That's a recommendation, in my mind. Does anybody want to comment on that?

Commissioner Henley: No, that's exactly correct. That was what my research showed. They had an opportunity to use, you know, more restrictive language and they chose not to do so. So that, to me, allows for the possibility in the future.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Candler: So I'm really torn on this as well and I've gone back and forth, so I have a question for Commissioner Henley because I kind of appreciate the comments of Commissioner Woodmansee. Are you amenable to modifying your motion at all in terms of language?

Commissioner Henley: Sure. Yes, the answer's yes. What would you have in mind?

Vice Chair Candler: Well, I think I would support – boy, I can't say it. Let me see – myself, I would probably support a recommendation from us to the Board of County Commissioners that – I'm looking at where you have "page 34" written there – that the word "prohibited" be replaced with "discouraged" or – yeah, I guess for simplicity's sake that's something I would support if that were your motion. Just the word "prohibited." That would take it away from being "prohibited" and it would cause it to be "discouraged," leaving, I guess, open a possibility. I don't know. And that might not go far enough for you and that's okay, but if you were to make that motion I would support that.

Commissioner Henley: Well, the way that I had the recommendation was that we simply delete that first sentence. And that gets rid of the prohibited. It also gets rid of the definition. But, you know, it doesn't fundamentally change anything, though. I'm still trying to allow something to be possible in the future. Call it outside-the-box thinking if you will.

Chair Raschko: My own feeling on it is that if we put the word "discouraged" in there it – to me that implies it's not wanted, whereas I think the way – what the original intent by Mr. Henley is to say that this thing, if it can be done in the future in a way that is acceptable, then it should be possible. And so – and I guess *that* implies that, hey, it's okay if you can figure out the way to do it.

Commissioner Mitchell: I've got a suggestion.

Chair Raschko: Instead of having a negative feel to it.

Commissioner Mitchell: I've got a suggestion.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you. So what we're – forgive the analogy. What we're dancing around with is describing something as the glass half empty or half full. Okay? And so if we say "prohibited" and "discouraged," that's the half empty, and the half full is saying "allowed" or "possible." And I'm still on the half – you know, the possible side. That still says that it doesn't have to be, it may or may not be. And it might be the word "possible" is maybe a shade under "allowed." But either "possible" or "allowed" leaves the possibility of something happening and opening without saying you really can't do this but we're putting the language in anyway. So I think we really do have to come to terms, each of us, on deciding if we're going to be on the positive side of it or the negative side of it.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Hughes and then Commissioner Henley and then Commissioner Candler.

Commissioner Hughes: Okay, this is Commissioner Hughes. I want to go back to I see the SMP as something that needs to be relooked at every – whether it's 10 years or not, it will be looked at again. And I feel there needs to be process to this and it can be looked at in the future through a process where more people are involved. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Commissioner Henley.

Commissioner Henley: Yes, thank you. What I'm trying to do here is to make sure we don't do what the City of Seattle did when it modified municipal code. It basically made it rigidly impossible to increase the number of houseboats, mostly on Lake Union but not just on Lake Union. But they wrote the most restrictive municipal code you've probably ever seen. Well, I don't know about that but, you know, it's certainly very restrictive. And so what I'm trying to do is to make sure that Skagit County doesn't follow their guidance and that we be a little innovative in our own right. And like Commissioner Mitchell said, maybe we take the glass-is-half-full approach as opposed to half-empty. I think that, you know, we're not going to do this tomorrow. I think that we should take a good look at it in the future. Maybe there'd be more process. Maybe there'll be more discussion. What I'm trying to do is at least get an anchor point in the current SMP so that it's not outright prohibited. And if you look at all the language that I've suggested that we take out, it mostly all is of the prohibitive nature and I think that's what we need to get out of there.

Chair Raschko: Okay. We've covered a lot of stuff. Hopefully the following comments will have some different points of view. So Commissioner Candler? In other words, let's not cover the same ground over and over.

Yeah, and this may fall into that category but I just wanted to respond to Commissioner Mitchell's comment, which was that "if we put liveaboards in marinas, adequate facilities may be allowed." Without that first sentence, that gives a lot of power to somebody to walk into the Department and say, This is allowed. You figure out how to do it – you know, whatever – or help me. And what I hear from Commissioner Henley is saying this is not something that we're ready for right now. And so I don't think just deleting that first sentence is really the proper approach right now, and as Commissioner Hughes says about the process and such, it would have to be an evolving document anyway. So given that I'm rehashing, I'll stop.

Chair Raschko: Okay, I'd ask Commissioner Henley if he's still open to changing the motion. Somebody recommended earlier that parts of number 3 be added, particularly – let's see: "Allow for the future possibility of floating homes and they can be properly sited, designed, supported, and regulated and" – and I would drop the word "connected" and put "and served by appropriate infrastructure such as access, power, water, and waste disposal."

Commissioner Henley: Yeah, I have no problem with that.

Commissioner Mitchell: I like that too.

Chair Raschko: Are you willing to amend the motion?

Commissioner Henley: I am.

Chair Raschko: How about – who seconded it?

Commissioner Mitchell: Mitchell. Second.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So are we ready to read the motion back, Mr. Gill?

Mr. Gill: \_\_\_\_\_. Yes, I believe the motion is that “Maintenance of public access should not be the responsibility of the landowner.”

Commissioner Henley: That’s the wrong part.

Mr. Gill: “I recommend that Skagit County SMP allow for the future possibility of floating homes when they can be properly sited, designed, supported, regulated, and connected to appropriate infrastructure including power, water, and waste disposal.”

Chair Raschko: Okay, I was recommending that “connected” be dropped and “served” be inserted. Just based on my example of the Ross Lake Resort which has its own septic collection system that is served by trucks emptying it on – in other words, it doesn’t *require* you be connected to a land-based system. In other words, it’s not out of the question that it could be self-supporting rather than being attached to the land-based utilities. Is that okay?

Commissioner Henley: Are you suggesting that the words “connected to” be deleted? Is that what you’re suggesting?

Chair Raschko: Yeah, and insert “served by.”

Mr. Gill: Served by.

Commissioner Henley: Oh, “served by.” Okay. I would agree with that.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. So are we ready for the question?

Vice Chair Candler: We do have a hand raised. I don’t know if the chair will recognize –

Chair Raschko: I’m sorry. I missed that. Who is that?

Vice Chair Candler: Betsy Stevenson.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead, Betsy.

Commissioner Henley: It’s muted.

Ms. Stevenson: I went for the wrong microphone. Anyway, Dan was nice enough to pull out what I was looking for. So I just want to – you talked about the shall or should in the WAC that we were referring to, so I just wanted to give you the definition so that you can consider it before you decide. I’m not trying to influence anybody’s decisions. But this is out of the WAC in terms of their definitions. It says “‘shall’ means a mandate. The action must be done. And “should” means that “the particular action is required unless there is a demonstrated compelling reason based on policy of the Shoreline Management Act and this chapter against taking the action.” So just adding that to your discussion. Thank you.

Commissioner Henley: It still leaves open the possibility.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah. Commissioner Henley and anybody else that's wanting to wordsmith this: If we start it off instead of saying "I recommend," would it be – would we just say "Recommend," or "We recommend"? And then moving on, from what Betsy just read for us about those, is there a problem if we said something like "We recommend the Skagit County SMP may allow"? What does "may allow" mean legally?

Vice Chair Candler: Can I answer that?

Chair Raschko: Please do.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah.

Vice Chair Candler: I think "may allow" – when you're asking the Board of County Commissioners to do something, you're just asking that they do it or not do it. I don't like the word "may" myself.

Commissioner Mitchell: Oh, okay. I understand. Yeah. It's better to –

Vice Chair Candler: It's less clear, I think.

Commissioner Mitchell: In a recommendation. Yeah.

Chair Raschko: So are – where are we? Can we legally do this or not?

Commissioner Henley: Well, it's *our* SMP. It seems to me we can do anything we want.

Chair Raschko: I would agree. I don't think we would have – I mean, nothing against Commissioner Candler but she's a member of the Commission. We don't have our outside legal advice. So anyway, shall we go to the question?

Vice Chair Candler: Betsy's raising her hand.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead, Ms. Stevenson.

Mr. Gill: Betsy, you're muted.

Ms. Stevenson: Just to clarify that last statement, this document is a joint document between the County and the State, so the State *does* have to approve this. So it isn't *our* document. It's a shared document and it's implemented, it's regulated, it's done in cooperation. It's one of the very few that's like this. But it isn't ours alone. The State has to approve this. So I just wanted to clear the record up for that. Thank you.

Commissioner Henley: Thanks for the clarification.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Candler, how do you vote?

Vice Chair Candler: I'll vote nay.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Commissioner Henley?

Commissioner Henley: Yea.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Hughes?

Commissioner Hughes: Nay.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Knutzen?

Commissioner Knutzen: Yes.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Rose?

Commissioner Rose: No.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yes.

Chair Raschko: And I vote yes, so that's one, two, three, four – what do we have?

Commissioner Mitchell: I think that was five yeas and three nays.

Mr. Gill: That's five yeas, three nays, yes.

Chair Raschko: How can that be a tie?

Mr. Gill: No, *three* nays.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Commissioner Candler was a nay.

Vice Chair Candler: But it's still three to five. It still passes.

Chair Raschko: All right. It passes. Thank you. Okay, Commissioner Henley, anything else?

Commissioner Henley: No. Those are the three things that I wanted to get addressed. I have nothing more for this evening.

Chair Raschko: Okay, does any other member of the Planning Commission have any matters that they wish to bring up?

Commissioner Henley: Commissioner Candler is raising her hand.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you. This has come up in a couple of individual comments but I would kind of like to – I don't know if I want to make a motion or just discuss this right now. There's been a lot of discussion about dock widths so I'm assuming we're going to want to put something in our

recorded motion about that. It might make sense to try to get an idea of what the Commissioners who haven't commented think about the Lake McMurray dock widths.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: There were a couple people who felt like, I think four feet was too restrictive and potentially dangerous and didn't apply really with androgynous (sic) – lack of androgynous fish or something like that. So if anyone wants to comment on that I think it might be a good idea to get a consensus.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee, did you raise your hand on this one?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I was just putting in for a comment on the – previously, but I can comment on this. I don't think – I don't believe that I've been convinced that dock width is an issue – that's a negative issue. I know when I see people fishing on the lakes most of the places they fish are around the docks. And it's because the fish hang out under the docks. And I feel like that my real life experience is the opposite of what the – for lack of a better terms, what's being represented as the Best Available Science when it comes to this subject. And so in particular – I think it's Lake Cavanaugh that was the lake that people were commenting on – when you have a four-foot-wide dock – and I can be corrected by staff, but I think it's a possibility that we may have changed that to six feet by agreement. But when you have a narrow dock and your water's five, six feet below your dock, it does become a bit of a safety concern. And so I'm just not convinced. I don't like the dock regulations at all – just being honest. If you have a dock that you have the proper decking on, I just don't see it as a negative. And I've seen a lot of people fishing around a lot of docks. You watch them go around a lake and they're literally dock to dock to dock to dock because that's where the fish are hanging out. So I think that we should – I would be fine with having something that was more in step – you'll probably straighten me out on this – that is more a site-specific, and lakes – water body-specific also. You know, this is why you can't do this on this particular spot because of x, y, and z.

So I'm not sure where to go with it, but I do think that four feet's too narrow. I *know* four feet's too narrow. You have two kids running past each other at four feet, I mean, it wouldn't take much for somebody to end up unknowingly off the dock. And that's what kids do on docks. They run from one end to the other and then they run back the other way and then next thing you know there's four of them doing that and they're going both directions at the same time. And so because I don't see the correlation between a negative impact on fish and environment and the dock width when they're properly built, I have a hard time with this particular section.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Joe. Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes, thank you. I'll co-sign what Commissioner Woodmansee said. I do think it's rather alarming the thought that the human safety aspect seems to have been – minimized is probably the most positive way to say that. And, unfortunately, that's really a shame because the human safety does matter and when you read the different passages from the different people that are living it – and I've got some communications from people before on what it's like using docks and kids, and been there myself with the cooler, with the kids and the dogs – and it matters. Safety matters. And some of these lakes, when it's – you know, when the water's high and, let's say, late spring and summer it's great. You know, you fall into the water instead of getting hurt. And I can't help but envision with not just the dock width but where the high water mark was supposed to be, is – you know, some of these – if the water's low and you've got a four-foot dock – which anybody, if you want to visualize, most city sidewalks are four feet wide, okay?

That's not very wide. So you've got some of these things where the water's – the time of year when the water's lower, and it happens at Big Lake, Lake Cavanaugh, I'm sure there's other places as well. Safety matters and our kids matter. Our spouses matter, our friends matter, the pets matter, our grandmas matter, and I think that it's a disservice for us to pretend that the safety isn't an issue. And a four-foot to a six-foot isn't that big of an increase when we're talking safety. And I've had the same experience my 60-some odd years here fishing on the docks and, you know, they're under there in the shade. Come on!

So, you know, I do appreciate the fact that people are willing to open back up that double table for us for the Lake Cavanaugh situation with the androgynous versus the non-androgynous fish. That's a part of it, but this – limiting this to four-foot-wide docks for long – for some places it could be a long way. We brought back up that visual that Peter put up for us on that 10% thing, that 10% permeable thing. Remember on the left side A there was a very long dock on it? Now if you've got low water and that were – I don't know how wide that one is. It was just four-feet-wide. You know, sometimes it's okay and sometimes it's not okay. And so I'm going to fall back on the side of saying four-foot's too narrow and/or recommend that it be site-specific, allow it for site-specific and use-specific. If you go back to the WACs, the WACs are talking about, you know, \_\_\_\_\_, meaning for how they're being used. I'm forgetting the exact words now. But you can go back and look at the WACs and you get the sense of it. So I do think it's very important for us to look at that issue and probably a little more in depth amongst ourselves. Thanks.

Chair Raschko: I apologize, Commissioner Henley. I know you ought to be next, but I'd just like to make a comment that elaborates on what Commissioner Mitchell was saying. And that's the fact that there's another place in the document where it recommends that outdoor lighting be pointed away from the area you're trying to protect unless in cases of public safety, in which case then it is okay to shine the light in a deleterious way. And I kind of look at the four-foot dock thing in the same light. Thank you. Mr. Henley?

Commissioner Henley: Yes, thank you. I think a four-foot dock width is kind of like walking a tightrope. If you look at a dock cart, for example, I think they tend to be about three feet wide. So if you've got a four-foot dock, you're only talking about six inches on either side of that dock cart while you're rolling it down the dock. That doesn't make any sense to me. I agree with Commissioner Woodmansee and Commissioner Mitchell. I think four-foot is just flat out dangerous and I think we ought to either – as Commissioner Mitchell suggested – allow for the possibility of the site-specific change or we go with six feet or more. I just don't see the four-foot dock as being reasonable.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Candler: We haven't heard from everybody, but I think for our purposes it might make sense to go ahead and move that this – make a motion on this. So I will formally move that we put in our recorded motion a recommendation that the Lake Cavanaugh dock width be six feet or site-specific.

Chair Raschko: Are we speaking just at Lake Cavanaugh or is this a generic motion?

Vice Chair Candler: I might need some help on this but I remember – I thought that that particular section of the code was specific to Cavanaugh. Maybe Peter can help – or somebody.

Mr. Gill: So one of the recommendations from the Department was to reinstate the previous table that had anadromous and non-anadromous fish. The six-foot dock width would apply to the non-



anadromous fish standard. The four-foot would still be in place for lakes or marine areas with salmonids.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay. Well, thank you for saying the fish name right. I was saying it wrong. Anadromous. Excuse me. It sounds like you're saying it's not – it would not be specific to Cavanaugh then.

Mr. Gill: No.

Vice Chair Candler: I'll amend my motion to "in those areas of the code where appropriate, the dock width be six feet or site-specific."

Commissioner Mitchell: I second the motion. This is Mitchell.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded and changed – can you read it, Peter, please?

Mr. Gill: Sure. Moved to add a motion – or add a recommendation to the recorded motion that in the appropriate areas dock widths should be six feet width.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. I'd like to start the discussion. What does the word "appropriate" mean and who decides? So we have – who's next?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Nobody.

Vice Chair Candler: Well, I can – I just meant everywhere in the code that it would apply. That's what I meant by "appropriate." No one would decide that except – I mean, I don't think it would be difficult to identify but I can't do it off the top of my head right now.

Chair Raschko: I guess in my mind the meaning of the word "appropriate" in the motion is ambiguous.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Does it mean where appropriate in the code? Or it could mean where appropriate on lakes and streams and rivers and stuff.

Vice Chair Candler: I agree. I just can't cite it in the code. I don't know where the numbers are! Maybe we can – we have a hand raised from –

Chair Raschko: Oh, do we?

Vice Chair Candler: – Ms. Stevenson trying to save us, save me.

Chair Raschko: Ms. Stevenson, please.

Ms. Stevenson: Thank you. It's okay to ignore me if you're in the middle of something and you don't want me to speak right then. It's perfectly fine. Peter kind of alluded to but I wanted to clarify a little bit just to make sure that you understand what we're suggesting in the table to put back in for kind of the standards for docks – that we would – we took it out because Ecology

recommended – Ecology and Fish and Wildlife recommended that we not differentiate between lakes with anadromous fish and lakes without anadromous fish. And based on the comments that we received and trying to address some of the issues with the folks at Lake Cavanaugh, who were the ones who commented on the dock width, putting that back in would allow for a six-foot dock width there. So just making sure.

And also there are different portions of the docks, so I want to be clear that you guys are aware of that and that you address all of them in your recommendation so that it gets you what you're looking for, if it's different than what we're proposing to the recommendation that we made in the public comment matrix of going back to the six-foot width in the non-anadromous fish lakes. Because in marine water the pier and the fixed piling portion is already at six feet. The ramp is at four feet. And I think the ramps are four feet across the board. I think that was something I remember that we talked to Ecology about and at least for the first x-number of feet, that ramp as you're going out into the water, they were pretty adamant about that being at four feet. But then the rest of the dock itself could expand to six in the areas that we have identified as six-foot \_\_\_ and fixed piling. And then the floating section was bigger too, which would be eight feet. So if you're going to change it, I want to make sure that you get what you want to change in the table or we're clear on what you're changing in the table. So I would just ask you to kind of clarify or review what the table looks like for the standards for docks for 14.26.420-1. We don't have to do that tonight if you don't want to. We can bring up the discussion again after you've had a chance to look at it, but in order that we're clear on what you're asking for too. So thank you.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay, so I have a question. If we were to – if I was to amend my motion to support the Department's recommendation to change the table, would that accomplish what we're trying to do, as far as dock width? It sounds like it would.

Ms. Stevenson: That's funny because that's the exact question that I was asking *you* in what I said!

Vice Chair Candler: Okay, well, I'm going to withdraw my motion since I can't figure out how to make it!

Ms. Stevenson: I can't answer that for you, but I just want to make sure that you realize that there's different sections of docks and they're made up of different things, and those width dimensions are different for the different components of the dock. And I have to start waving my hands. I'm sorry and I apologize for that. So when you say a six-foot dock width, what do you mean? What portions of those components are you talking about? We need to have that clear so that we understand it too. And, like I said, I just wanted you to revisit that. You don't have to do it tonight. You can go ahead and have your discussion and make your motion. You can look at it. We can talk about it next time, too, if you want to. So I wanted clarification too. Thank you.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay. Thank you. I guess I think if I can't identify these places off the top of my head right now maybe it's best to withdraw the motion and just keep further discussion for another time. I don't know. Unless somebody has a better way of how to word this.

Chair Raschko: Well, I believe the portions – aren't they – you have the dock, which goes out, then you have the ramp, which goes down to the water level, and then you have the floating part. And I presume we're talking about the first.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Betsy?

Ms. Stevenson: I'm talking to myself with my mic off. On page 96 of the document, it shows you the components so that it'll give you a better sense of what's what and what we're talking about in the table. So I would just ask if you guys just take a look at that so that we can make sure that we get it down right and we understand what you're asking for, you know. I'm not questioning what you're proposing. It just doesn't seem like we're that far off, so I want to make sure that it's real clear both based on the components in Figure 14.26.420-1 on page 96 and then the table on page – hopefully it's the same; I just pulled it up from the one online – page 100, 14.26.420-1 table – 420-1, the Standards for Docks.

Chair Raschko: So which are we talking about?

Ms. Stevenson: I don't know if we can get them up side-by-side or not.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Candler –

Vice Chair Candler: Well, and we've never really clarified in our discussions but I always assumed everyone was talking about the pier fixed piles portion. Everybody's more careful on a ramp, you know, and the floating segment's going to be – well, I don't know. But I assumed we were talking about the pier/slash/fixed pile.

Commissioner Mitchell: I was, if that helps.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, that's what I had in my mind was the fixed part of it. And, again, I do appreciate the fact that they're willing to split that table back out for the androgynous and non-androgynous (sic). But the comments, I think, still hold true for the safety issue for people. I'm looking at this – I guess what I'm trying to say is I'm looking at the table split that would serve non-androgynous lakes like Lake Cavanaugh, and who knows where else, is one issue. That's a separate issue. I was \_\_\_ by Commissioner Candler's first motion. I was backing up with the idea of a six-foot dock or, you know, what would be a site-appropriate as a separate issue. So that's all I'm going to try to stumble through now.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I will say this: Sometimes you have a fixed dock that is your pathway out to your main floating dock. Sometimes you have a floating dock that is your pathway out to a larger floating dock. So the width issue really should apply to both of those, not just the fixed dock, because I've seen docks that are 40 feet long and it's just a series of narrow floaters, and then they get out to a larger dock. That's their, you know, base for their boat and stuff like that. And then they'll take them in over – in the winter, they'll take those sections out and stack them on their shore and then put them back out in the summer again. But that's actually, you know, their pathway out to their main, you know, dock where they can actually park their boat and actually, you know, put their skis or their boards or whatever in between uses and stuff. So I would think the width should apply to both the piling fixed situation *and* what would be basically the walkway out to your recreational dock. I mean, a floating dock at four feet wide in the wind is even more dangerous than a fixed dock at four feet wide if it's a pathway and not the actual, you know, ending point of where you're using your recreational stuff.

Commissioner Mitchell: That really helps. Thank you.

Ms. Stevenson: Peter? Can you forward a couple of pages and get to the table too so that they have a sense of what the dimensions are? And maybe if you guys are willing – Dan’s got his hand up. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Why don’t you go ahead, Dan, please?

Mr. Nickel: I was just going to pull up the February version of the table so you could see how it’s split out. That’s all.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Mr. Nickel: And if you bring up the table here, the only difference from the February version is the – that middle section where it has four-foot for single use and six-foot for joint use for lakes. That would just apply in lakes with anadromous fish, and otherwise it’s six feet wide. That’s the only difference between those two tables. But you’ll see there that the floating sections are actually eight feet wide. And so for a situation like Lake Cavanaugh or any lake that has a fairly high fluctuation, I would think that the preference would be to use a float in those lake situations. And so, you know, in that case you would have a six foot wide walkway on fixed pile that goes to a ramp that goes down to an eight-foot-wide floating section. That would certainly lower your, you know, walking area and any concerns that people have about safety for the majority of that pier length.

Chair Raschko: Can I ask – on this table, community docks can be eight feet wide, all segments. Is that both an anadromous fish lake and non-anadromous fish lakes?

Mr. Nickel: That is how we had it in the February version – was it applied to all lakes.

Chair Raschko: The fact that it’s owned by a community instead of an individual then influences fish \_\_\_?

Mr. Nickel: Well, I think the intent there is to recognize that a community dock would be serving multiple lots and therefore would reduce the number of pier structures on a shoreline, and so there’s more allowances for larger structures so you don’t have as many, you know, nearshore walkways that inhibit salmon migration. That’s the intent.

Chair Raschko: Okay, I’m sorry to beat this to death. I thought that what happened is that when a fish hit a shadow and it was more than four feet wide it screwed the fish up and he couldn’t go any further along the shoreline and had to go out in the deep water and around and everything else. So that seems to me to be independent of how many repetitions there are. Anyway, Commissioner Henley, you had a comment.

Commissioner Henley: Yes, this is a question for staff. Is there a specification on the angle of the ramp? In other words, how steep can it be?

Mr. Nickel: I don’t know of any regulation on how steep it can be.

Commissioner Henley: Because it seems to me that, you know, as you get it steeper it becomes more dangerous. That’s why I asked the question. We’re talking safety here.

Mr. Nickel: I think that would have to do with the length of the ramp then. I'm sure that –

Commissioner Henley: Of course. But if you don't specify it, it could be anything.

Chair Raschko: Okay, I think we need to kind of try to wrap this up. I'd ask Commissioner Candler – it was recommended maybe we come back to this. Do you want to push forward?

Vice Chair Candler: Well, I think I don't – I'd just hate to lose whatever ground we've gained tonight. I mean, I can make a motion that – I will move that we recommend a six-foot max width for individual pier/slash/fixed piling docks.

Chair Raschko: Is there a second?

Commissioner Mitchell: I second the motion.

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's moved and seconded to – Mr. Gill, would you give us the exact verbiage, please?

Mr. Gill: Sure. The motion was to recommend max width for pier or fixed piling dock to be six feet.

Chair Raschko: Maximum. Okay, any more discussion?

Commissioner Mitchell: Hold it. I think she said for single use, too. Was that –

Mr. Gill: Sorry.

Vice Chair Candler: I don't care how it's worded. Individual and joint or individual – I said individual. Max width for individual docks be six feet for pier/slash/fixed piling.

Chair Raschko: Okay, I'm sorry about the semantics but an individual dock means a single dock as opposed to –

Vice Chair Candler: Single-user, yeah.

Chair Raschko: Instead of, like, a community dock versus a whole bunch of docks.

Vice Chair Candler: No. Single versus joint. I want to try to make single match joint on this chart. Six-foot for both.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Any more comments, discussion?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All right. Commissioner –

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a question.

Chair Raschko: Oh, you do? All right.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Are you making this motion \_\_\_\_ would be – are you conditioning on whether there's – what type of fish are in the water body? Or is this across the board? And I ask the question because I fall back to Commissioner Mitchell's comment that safety doesn't go away just because of the type of fish that are in the water when it comes to the narrowness of the dock.

Vice Chair Candler: Well, if I understood correctly, this would not distinguish on fish type. Is that correct?

Commissioner Woodmansee: That is my question to you, exactly that. So you're recommending this motion apply to either water body.

Vice Chair Candler: Right, because I'm looking – right. This table just says standards for docks, so if it's the standard for docks and we manage to get it to say six feet, I feel like it will change the code everywhere where it's supposed to. Hopefully. Betsy's got her hand up. Go ahead, please.

Ms. Stevenson: Tammy, I just want to let you know that what we proposed – and this is what's in the document now, but Dan was going to pull up the old one where we did split it between anadromous and non-anadromous. So the non-anadromous would be at six feet width and the anadromous would be at four, so you're just saying you want it six all the way across, it sounds like – right? So that would be different than what the staff recommended we would do. We were going to just put it back to the way it was before Ecology had us change it.

Vice Chair Candler: In terms of the wording of the motion, if I – this table right here, Standards for Docks, doesn't distinguish, so how do I know if that's the right way to phrase this?

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah, that's what's confusing. We're recommending the change to take it back to the way it was before where we *do* differentiate. This is the one that's here. I don't know. Maybe I'm confusing you even more. Is you want it to be six feet across the board – that's what Joe's asking you – then you're not making a different change in between anadromous and non-anadromous, and that's just the only thing that I wanted to clarify.

Vice Chair Candler: And the Department's recommendation is going to be –

Ms. Stevenson: Our recommendation is still that it would be anadromous or non-anadromous. So I just wanted you to be aware so that it's clear. And it's not very clear, I'm guessing. I'm okay with that if that's what you want. I just want to make sure –

Vice Chair Candler: I'm sorry, no, that – no, my frustration is not remembering exactly how many lakes are affected. Are we just talking about Cavanaugh now then?

Chair Raschko: I presume we're talking about – we're talking about marine waters, lakes, and rivers.

Vice Chair Candler: I know, but I'm specifically asking Betsy: How many lakes do we have that don't have that kind of fish? I mean, is it just Cavanaugh?

Ms. Stevenson: I'd ask Dan. I'm trying to run through them all in my mind and I'm not sure.

Mr. Nickel: Yeah, and I don't have that offhand.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay. Well –

Ms. Stevenson: I think Big Lake might, actually. Maybe Joe knows. You probably know what's in Big Lake. But, yeah, I wouldn't want to try to guess. I don't think it's just Cavanaugh but I don't know all the other lakes right off the top of my head to run through them.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Sadly, I don't know the answer to that.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Henley, you had something?

Commissioner Henley: I've forgotten whatever it was so I'll pass.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So are we ready for a vote? All right, Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Candler: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Henley?

Commissioner Henley: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Hughes?

Commissioner Hughes: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Knutzen?

Commissioner Knutzen: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Rose?

Commissioner Rose: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Aye.

Chair Raschko: And I vote "aye" so that passes unanimously. Thank you.

How's everybody's endurance?

Commissioner Mitchell: I'm starting to wane, if you really want to know the truth! This has been a very intense night, but good. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, what I propose to do then when we return to our deliberations is continue in this vein and then if nobody else has any hot issues, move on to the recorded motion. So

thanks, everybody, for all your effort, and that'll conclude our deliberations for this meeting. And we'll turn to the Director's Update.

Hal Hart: Thank you, Commissioners. Excellent job. I was busy looking up things, including anadromous fish and which lakes they occur in but I didn't quite have the data. I was almost there. But we'll keep looking.

Peter's got a quick presentation for me. If you can pull up the second slide, that'd be great. So we're continuing to work with two really big kinds of permitting right now. One's the commercial permits.

Amazon is busy getting their – they're laying their foundation, their concrete pad, right now.

We continue up at the Port with a whole bunch of other projects. We're continuing to work with both the Westland Distillery – there's a picture there – as well as I believe it's Chuckanut Brewery is moving out of Bellingham – at least in part out of Bellingham, opening a tasting room here and then also down in Portland, so that was kind of interesting.

Let's move to the next slide, Peter, if you can. Okay, we have multiple potato sheds right now. It may not be as interesting to this group as that is to the others but I love to see continued investment in agriculture and infrastructure. So there's at least a couple of those moving forward and it's doing well.

We have some rural development that's been proposed. This is a – they call it a business center, but it's really – or a business park at Clear Lake. It's been there – pretty much for 120 years there's been some use on this. You know, there's a long history of development at Clear Lake, and I think it illustrates to me kind of a missed opportunity in Growth Management and how things have been frozen in time. What's being proposed right now is if you look in that picture where the old white building there is they want to put a new office building in there and have some employment there. There are other changes that they're proposing as well. But people do want to invest in these areas. These areas are, you know, vital to the rural part of our community and there are various business ventures on this particular site in Clear Lake.

And I just pull out the history here. One of the things that the community has been asking for is updated sidewalks. The sidewalks you see here to the left have been kind of falling apart over the decades since they were invested in. Long before Growth Management they had concrete sidewalks in Clear Lake. And then here's an example of the mixed use that *did* use to live and be in Clear Lake right here. So that was both a hotel, a store, and served as a post office and many other functions historically. A museum, if everybody's been there can, you know, corroborate that.

So let's go to the next one.

Chair Raschko: Can I break in for just a moment?

Mr. Hart: Absolutely.

Chair Raschko: People might be interested to know that that site right there used to be the site of the largest inland sawmill in the world: Clear Lake Lumber.

Mr. Hart: Yep. It's truly an amazing history at Clear Lake and that's what I'm trying to pull up. But I think it's – you know, what is its future? And that's the purpose of comprehensive planning – is



to look at that and go, Oh, what can you do there? And there are bills circulating in the state legislature. One of them came – well, several of them are all tied together in the last legislative session and the one dealing with rural LAMIRDs didn't get out and several others didn't get out. But had it gotten out, it may have allowed some additional employment, some infill development to occur. And so this would be – you know, here we have folks trying to make a living on this site. After 100 years of doing that, they're still trying to figure it out, right? So I just want to \_\_\_ and just focus on that because there are great photos of over a thousand workers on this site at one point. Right? It's just amazing.

So, okay, let's move on. So here's the current list, the project list: the Amazon; Sakata Seed; Distillery Expansion; Brewery Expansion; Heritage Flight Museum. We have multiple hangars. There's actually – there's a t-hangar, there's a smaller than the commercial hangar size, and then the commercial hangar size.

Then there's Vander Yacht Propane, which actually has a rail spur going on, and we're trying to get them under permit. PACCAR testing facility did finish their Phase I this summer, and the next phase would either be a testing facility or expansion of the cafeteria. But they want to increase their employment and, as everybody knows, car and truck manufacturing are going through several revolutions at the same time, whether it's electric or non-driving or just trying to get better and better efficiencies or alternative fuels. All those are going on and they want to test them here in Skagit County.

Vikima Seed is the last one on that list. But there are many others and the Port is looking at some subdivisions that would allow for maybe another 10, you know, or so entities to go in there. So they're looking in the long term.

Next slide. Next meeting – go ahead, Peter.

Mr. Gill: Thanks, Hal. So, yeah, it comes down to the second meeting in October, October 26<sup>th</sup>. We will follow up, obviously, with deliberations – keep going here. We will also start the discussion about the Capital Facilities Plan Annual Update. We'll have a work session on that. That will include the Transportation Improvement Program. And so that sets us up for a hearing on the Capital Facilities Plan November 9<sup>th</sup>. So we'll have to double-up next meeting a little bit.

As far as ongoing efforts in the Department. Like I said, the Capital Facilities Plan, we're getting through that – getting final touches, getting staff reports, everything else set up to get that passed in November so it can be adopted with the budget in December as usual.

The other thing that's happening is the Agritourism project. We are continuing to work on that and we're looking in a little more detail about the different policy options, and we'll be presenting to the Ag Advisory Board tomorrow night on the policy options for agritourism as that moves forward.

Other news: As you heard in the beginning, we have a new team member. So extra help for all of you all as well as myself and the Department. So very excited for that.

That's all I have.

Mr. Hart: Peter, I've got three more things. One is there is a TIP meeting coming up this fall prior to that – the Public Works office will hold. So if anybody's interesting in where they're proposing those transportation improvements – do you have a date on that one yet?

Mr. Gill: I don't know that's been announced yet, but I will make sure that goes out as well.

Mr. Hart: Okay. And then just two other notes. There are quite a number of issues are evolving or revolving around housing, so we're continuing to coordinate at the regional level on that. So we'll bring you more on that as that advances. The Cities are busy with various housing efforts. I believe there are two main housing efforts. I was just looking at Mount Vernon's website. So right on College Way there will be a – I believe it's a 50-unit low-to-moderate income housing development, and that will be near the graveyard. And then further out on College Way, I believe there's another 50-unit development going. I think it's towards the last light before you leave Mount Vernon, on the left side as if you were headed out to Big Lake. So expect some more there.

Why I bring that up is because it's so critical with the housing need that we have that we coordinate and are encouraging one another to invest in housing. So for those new folks that are trying to hire into the county, housing is always seen as a holdup for those companies in Skagit County.

That's it.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Are there any questions for Hal or other members of the staff?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you very much for your report.

Planning Commissioners Comments and Announcements. We'll start with Joe.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I want to say something about housing. I've spent the last two weekends out-of-state – two weekends ago in Arizona, last weekend in Texas – looking at property and housing in particular. And a true story here: My wife and I are looking to relocate some investments to a different location, and the housing issue is not just in Washington State. I mean, we probably looked at 30 houses in the last two weekends, and we had – as fast as we got houses on our list in some areas, by the time we could actually see them and evaluate, Hey, would we consider something here, they'd be sold. And so the housing – I can call it a crisis for sure in Washington State – is not just Washington State. So I guess my comment is how important housing is. It's really critical to our economy and to our state and to our people. And so anything that we can do to make housing easier, more affordable, and all that is a step in the right direction.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Joe.

Mr. Hart: Commissioners, I would like to note that Betsy Stevenson is doing double-duty representing several staff right now. And she was busy reviewing a whole bunch of housing in mid – I think it's probably mid-county that you were looking at this afternoon. So I wanted to thank Betsy for doing that and trying to move some of those permits along. So we are short-staffed here and Betsy's been pulling some extra hours in, and so I just wanted to say thank you to Betsy.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Martha?

Commissioner Rose: Well, since Joe brought up the housing thing: We really need to – my humble opinion is that we really need to densify our urban areas and we need to do that by allowing – following Portland and Seattle's lead by allowing up to three to four housing units on every single single-family lot within the urban boundaries. And I know that the County doesn't have control over the Cities, but conversations can be had. Start planting the seeds because you

can get a single-family loan for up to a four-unit apartment building as long as it's owner-occupied. And there's no reason why the zoning shouldn't follow suit with the banking rules. Anyway, that's my two cents.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Martha. Kathy?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes. Welcome, Jen. We are so glad that you decided to come onboard. You're a lucky gal because you're working with a particularly good group of professionals, and we really appreciate seeing you and hope to get to talk to you sometime a little bit more in the future one-on-one, two-to-one, something like that. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Mark.

Commissioner Knutzen: Thank you, Tim. I have nothing.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Amy?

Commissioner Hughes: I would like to publicly congratulate Martha Rose for her award she received in Denver, Colorado. And my mind has been very busy today so I'd like her to repeat what the award was so the public knows that we have builders that are being recognized nationally.

Chair Raschko: You're on, Martha!

Commissioner Rose: So in 2008 I partnered up with Department of Energy, striving to build homes that are net zero. And I never applied for their awards until this year and – because Abbott's Alley became net positive, so we're producing – each home produces a surplus of power. And so many people say it can't be done in the Pacific Northwest, but not only *can* it be done but we did it for the same general price range with the solar – you know, including the solar. We were selling for the same price range as our competitors who didn't have any of the energy-saving features or the Healthy Home aspects.

So at any rate, it's a new way to think about housing where you think about the house as a system. Instead of just putting a bunch of things together and calling it a house you think about it from the design point of view and then all the components that go into it. They all have to – they work together to achieve the same goal. So at any rate, about 1% of the builders, or less than 1% of the builders nationally are participating in this program. And it takes time to figure it out but when you figure it out you realize, gosh, it doesn't cost any more to do this, and that's the bonus. But, you know, there's a learning curve. At any rate, I'm still doing it, and we have two under construction right now and hopefully they will, too, be net zero. But thank you, Amy. I appreciate that.

Chair Raschko: Well, congratulations.

Commissioner Rose: Yeah, thank you.

Chair Raschko: That's great. Vince?

Commissioner Henley: I have nothing at this time.

Chair Raschko: Tammy?

Vice Chair Candler: Congratulations, Martha. I've been to Abbott's Alley. It's beautiful, beautifully done, and I don't have anything else.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. I just want to thank staff and all of my fellow Commissioners for all the hard work and effort. And with that we'll say good night and be adjourned. Thank you, everybody.

Several Commissioners: Good night.