

**Skagit County Planning Commission
Update: Capital Facilities Plan
Deliberations: SMP Update
October 26, 2021**

Planning

Commissioners:

**Kathy Mitchell
Mark Knutzen
Vince Henley (absent last half)
Amy Hughes
Tim Raschko, Chair
Joe Woodmansee
Tammy Candler, Vice Chair (absent)
Martha Rose**

Staff:

**Hal Hart, Planning Director
Betsy Stevenson, Senior Planner
Peter Gill, Long Range Planning Manager
Jenn Rogers, Assistant Long Range Planner
Forrest Jones, Public Works Transportation/Programs Section
Manager**

Others:

Dan Nickel, Consultant (The Watershed Company)

Chair Tim Raschko: Good evening. Welcome to the October 26th, 2021, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission. We'll start with a roll call. I see Commissioner Hughes and Commissioner Henley.

Commissioner Vince Henley: Yep, I'm here.

Chair Raschko: And – let's see – Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Joe Woodmansee: I'm here.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Rose, I see you're here. And Commissioner Mitchell, are you still around?

Commissioner Henley: I don't see her on the screen.

Chair Raschko: Yeah, she was here but – okay. Commissioner Knutzen?

Commissioner Mark Knutzen: I'm here.

Chair Raschko: Oh, okay. Good. Thank you. And Commissioner Candler.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, so no Commissioner Candler. Okay, would anybody care to make a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting?

Commissioner Henley: I'll make a motion.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I'll second it.

Chair Raschko: So Commissioner Henley, you made the motion?

Commissioner Henley: I did.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Knutzen seconded. Is there any discussion of the minutes?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: If not, then all in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Any opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: No abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, so that is approved. Thank you. Coming to the end of the year, we have a lot on our plate and in December there is only a single meeting scheduled and that is for the 14th. We had some discussions today about the possibility of fitting in another meeting either in late November or early December, say the 30th or the 7th of December, which would be a week before the regular meeting. Has anybody got any feelings about that?

Peter Gill: Commissioner Hughes has her –

Commissioner Amy Hughes: Yeah. Tim, this is Amy Hughes. I couldn't get to the Comment button – sorry. I was looking at the calendar and I was going to bring it up at the end and just point out that the Tuesday before Thanksgiving _____ (no sound), and that might not be a problem; it might be for people trying to get away. And I was wondering if we could do the first Tuesday in November and then the third Tuesday, then we could maybe put another meeting more comfortably in. But somebody would have to look at the calendar because I didn't know about this second part.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So you're proposing *when* in November?

Commissioner Hughes: I don't have my phone in front of me. But I think that we usually go the second and fourth Tuesday. Isn't that correct?

Chair Raschko: Right.

Commissioner Hughes: Yeah. And Peter, do you have a calendar that you can tell which Tuesday –

Mr. Gill: Yeah, I do.

Chair Raschko: The 9th and the 23rd.

Commissioner Hughes: Is our scheduled.

Mr. Gill: Yeah, the current schedule is for the 9th and the 23rd. The first Tuesday in November is the 2nd of November. The third Tuesday in November is the 16th.

Commissioner Hughes: Mm-hmm, yeah. That would be correct. And then maybe there's room after Thanksgiving for another meeting if you need another one?

Mr. Gill: There is the 30th.

Commissioner Martha Rose: I'd like to comment.

Chair Raschko: Please do.

Commissioner Rose: Based on not having a meeting, I signed up for a bunch of classes for a few days in a row, including that Tuesday, so I wouldn't be able to attend that one.

Commissioner Hughes: Okay, yeah. It was just a thought. I'm not intent on it.

Commissioner Rose: Not that my – I mean, I know we all miss meetings occasionally. I'm just saying I wouldn't be there.

Commissioner Hughes: Well, and I could make it that Tuesday since it's all video anyway. I just thought that would give us another week to do something more.

Commissioner Henley: I don't have my calendar in front of me, so I don't know what to say.

Chair Raschko: Peter, as I recall back in those awful days when I had a job there was a function in – I think in the – what's the Microsoft email program? Anyway –

Commissioner Henley: Outlook.

Chair Raschko: Outlook, yes! How quickly I forget! Anyway, where people could send a thing around and people could put in the proposed dates that they want and everybody's kind of working on the same calendar. Would it be possible to do something like that?

Mr. Gill: Yeah, I think we could arrange that to look at the options for getting maybe another meeting in before the end of the year.

Chair Raschko: Mm-hmm. Well, why don't we give that a try?

Mr. Gill: I could do that.

Commissioner Henley: I have a preference that we not schedule *more* than one extra meeting. One extra meeting I can do, but I'm doing prep for a class that I teach so...

Chair Raschko: I don't think you'll have much worry about that, Vince. I think *one* extra meeting is plenty –

Commissioner Henley: Okay.

Chair Raschko: – coming into this time of year.

Commissioner Woodmansee: How many days' notice do we have to have before we set up a meeting, Peter?

Mr. Gill: Well, so this one, since it's not on our annual schedule, would be a special meeting, but we really just need to post it at least 24 hours in advance. So I'm not too worried about that. I'm more worried about being able to provide meeting materials to you all with that quick of a turnaround, with a – you know, week-to-week. But I think, you know, depending on what happens I think as long as we're in deliberation that shouldn't be hard for us to do.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so we'll look forward to you getting something out, and people do their best to see what days work best collectively. Thank you.

Okay, we're moving on. We are going to have an update on the annual Capital Facilities Plan, so that – please go ahead, Peter.

Mr. Gill: Yeah, thank you, Chair. So every year we do update our Capital Facilities Plan. It is a component of the Comprehensive Plan. I do have some – about 10 slides to run through tonight to kind of reorient ourselves with the Capital Facilities Plan just to provide some context. So tonight we're just ___ on it _____ (sound dropped in and out) by hearing on the 23rd. And this is normally adopted with the annual budget in December. And I think last year it was December 5th on which the Board adopted their budget. So with that, I will share my screen here.

Okay, so the Capital Facilities Plan is a plan for six years into the future. So what *is* capital facilities planning? It is a required element of the Growth Management Act that supports the Comprehensive Plan. Kind on a general basis, it's basically all the infrastructure that is needed to support development and –

Commissioner Henley: We're not seeing your shared screen.

Mr. Gill: Oh! I'm sorry. Let me see. How's that?

Commissioner Henley: That's better.

Mr. Gill: All right. Thank you. You didn't miss much, just this one. So it's the infrastructure that's needed to support development, and that's what you'll find in our Capital Facilities Plan. And we're looking at these six years down the road in terms of what projects will be built and how they would be funded. The plan is to ensure that we don't build or grow faster than we can actually support with the infrastructure.

This Capital Facility Plan addresses areas in the unincorporated part of the county and outside of the urban growth areas. Another key to the Capital Facilities Plan is that we can't charge impact fees if the projects aren't identified or the plan is not identified in our Capital Facilities Plan.

And how it equates with the state Growth Management Act: "The County ensures that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current levels of service below locally established standards." And so what you'll see in the Capital

Facilities Plan and discussed in kind of the narrative is the level of service and whether we're meeting those.

Our definition – we do have a definition for the facilities. It's any publicly-owned structure, improvement, or asset that meets the following criteria: something related to providing facilities or services that are related to development; it exists now or may be needed during the current 20-year planning horizon, and that starts at 2016 through 2036; that it requires an expenditure of public funds over and above the annual maintenance and operation expenses; and it costs more than \$10,000 so we're not tracking things less than \$10,000; and it has a life expectancy of 10 years or more.

So this plan, all the capital facilities – unlike in some places – all the capital facilities are integrated into a single document. It doesn't include the policies. So you'll still see the policies related to capital facilities in our Comprehensive Plan. This is just the projects, right?

There's kind of two sections. There's the County-owned and County-managed facilities, and then there's the special purpose districts like fire districts, school districts, water districts, things like that. That's how the document is split up.

And then transportation is separate yet again in that it is integrated through our Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program. And I think Forrest is here from Public Works, if we do have questions about that. And that was sent out as part of your meeting materials as well.

A little bit about updates to this document: So we do it every year, kind of a six-year rolling document. The state rules require that we update it every two years. This year because of kind of resources in the spring when we get this rolling, we only – we focused on County-owned facilities. So some years we go out and we do mailings and we send emails to, you know, dozens of fire districts and dike and drainage districts and school districts and you-name-it, right? So there's, like, hundreds of requests for data and information and plans that we make to all the special purpose districts. We didn't do that this year, but we did do – what we did do is integrate changes when the special purpose districts made sure we knew about it, right? When they actually made a change and said, Hey, County, we updated our plan, we've made sure to integrate those. But we didn't go fetching a bunch of information like we normally do. That makes it a little more manageable.

And the last bullet here is just about integrating. There's a special exemption for doing this outside of other Comp Plan amendments in that it can be integrated into the budget if adopted with a local budget.

So getting to the changes this year, there are quite a few changes regarding text – moving, you know, what the current updated numbers are for 2022 through 2027. There were updates to, like, employment in the county, district court cases. Those kinds of things all got updated. Projects got pulled off that were completed, things like that. But as far as new projects in there, there's a couple to note. One is insulation of a 100-kilowatt solar system on the Community Justice Center, so that's planned to begin at least next year. And then the stormwater district projects were updated to reflect kind of general updates within the entire NPDES area – that's the National Pollution Discharge Elimination Service area.

A couple of the external changes: So within the special purpose districts you'd see in there we've added the Blanchard-Edison Water System Plan in there, so there's a slight change in the boundary to incorporate part of Colony Mountain System. So that was an agreement between

those so we've added that. There's a new capital facilities plan for the Sedro-Woolley School District, as well as the City of Anacortes, who updates theirs every year.

We also updated the school district enrollment numbers in the table there for all the districts, or at least the seven districts that we have, based on the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, data for 2020 to 2021. I think the original – the numbers that were in there were from, like, 2018 or 19, so those updated.

And just a little bit more about the Transportation Improvement Program: This is also updated annually and shows anticipated projects over the next six years. This document is incorporated by reference within the Capital Facilities Plan. It is developed and managed by Public Works. They have a whole separate website set up to take comments where they actually have a nice comment form where the public can comment on the projects. They also do a work session and a public hearing in front of the Board of County Commissioners, and that is actually scheduled for November 23rd, 2021.

So part of our evaluation and in the staff report that you received with the meeting materials, we have the Department recommendation. One of the things that we're required to look at is whether we – if there are any setbacks in terms of what projects were anticipated to be put in the ground related to development that did or didn't go forward. If there are changes to those we would have to reevaluate what our land use plan is and potentially change our Comp Plan to adjust to those changes to the facilities or infrastructure being put in the ground. So we didn't see any of those major changes this year, so based on those projects the locations of levels of services described in the Capital Facilities Plan, a reassessment of the Land Use Element of the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan is not required.

And then for public input, we do have a website where you'll see the Notice of Availability that went out last Thursday. That is posted on our website at skagitcounty.net/cfp, as in Capital Facilities Plan. A public hearing November 9th, 2021; deliberation November 23rd; and then this would go before the Board of County Commissioners concurrent with the budget adoption for December.

Comments: Public comments can be emailed to pdscomments@co.skagit.wa.us or mailed to the – to our office here at Skagit County PDS, 1800 Continental Place, Mount Vernon 98273. And the written comment period is open until November 11th.

With that, I will take questions. I also want to acknowledge Forrest Jones is here from Public Works. I appreciate you being here, Forrest, and if there's any questions that you all have, he can take those.

Commissioner Henley: I have one question.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead, please.

Forrest Jones: Yeah, go ahead.

Commissioner Henley: I guess that's me! On the TIP on the front page you've got the map that shows a lot of different projects on the map. There are two number 17s which are supposedly related to the Guemes Ferry Project, but they are several miles apart from one another, so can you explain to me what that is?

Mr. Jones: Sure. Let me pull it up here.

Mr. Gill: I think I have it, Forrest, if you want me to just show my screen here.

Mr. Jones: Yeah, that'd be great.

Commissioner Henley: It's on Fidalgo Island. Yeah, 17 there and 17 up there. They can't both be the same project. That one and that one.

Mr. Jones: Yeah, that is – good job, you caught one of my mistakes! So the 17 down on Fidalgo Island is actually a streetlight illumination project at Marine Drive and Havekost, I believe. So that is no longer on this TIP. It was dropped off this TIP because we are planning on doing that project end of this year, early next year. So once we start construction and obligate funding, it will drop off the TIP, so that's just a spot that I missed. I apologize for that.

Commissioner Henley: Okay, so it's basically just an error. I have a second question. As I go through all of these individual project – I guess I would call them “drafts” of the project and its cost and definition and so on, I was trying to figure out how to relate those individual pages to the numbers on the map and I couldn't find any way to do that. Is there a way that you can correlate the individual projects with the items on ___?

Mr. Jones: Yeah, but the map is just – the projects on the map are just – the numbers are just an I.D. on the map to tell you what project it is. They don't correlate to the actual page numbers on the TIP.

Commissioner Henley: Okay. All right, so that's what I decided was probably the case, but I think you've just confirmed it. Okay, so there's basically no way to link these individual draft pages with the numbers on the map.

Mr. Jones: Yeah, I can try to do a better job with that. Basically the projects on the map are – I just put them in alphabetical order or try to, except for the new projects that are a, b, c, d.

Commissioner Henley: Okay. Well, that answers my questions anyway. Thank you.

Mr. Jones: Now if you – do you have the next page to this, Peter?

Mr. Gill: Yes.

Mr. Jones: Yeah, okay. So yeah, this isn't the latest. If you go onto our website and go to the latest one it has a narrative of each project. That narrative correlates – you'll see a little page number underneath the narrative and it will correlate to the page number on the TIP.

Commissioner Henley: Okay.

Mr. Jones: I could show that to you guys, if you want me to.

Commissioner Henley: It might be worthwhile taking a look.

Mr. Jones: Yeah. Okay, can you guys see that?

Commissioner Henley: Yeah.

Mr. Jones: Okay, so here's the latest and greatest. I finished this yesterday but then I added this narrative to each project.

Commissioner Henley: Okay, yeah. We don't have a copy of that.

Mr. Jones: Yeah. So if you go onto the Public Works website and go to Transportation Programs you can pull this. This is on that website.

Commissioner Henley: Okay.

Mr. Jones: Just for instance, the second one down here, Cascade River Bridge Deck Rehabilitation, you'll see underneath it it says "page 7." It gives a little short narrative. So if you would go to page 7, you'll see the page numbers on the lower right.

Commissioner Henley: Yep.

Mr. Jones: You'll see that.

Commissioner Henley: Okay, good.

Mr. Jones: See that project.

Commissioner Henley: Yeah. This is the sort of thing I was looking for.

Mr. Jones: Yeah, so hopefully that helps. And I don't know if Peter gave you guys my spreadsheet or not.

Mr. Gill: I did not distribute the spreadsheet.

Mr. Jones: Okay.

Mr. Gill: But I could send that along with the narrative.

Mr. Jones: Yeah, you can send that and I also have a spreadsheet that breaks it down a little more. It kind of condenses it a little more from 60-some pages to 8 pages. It basically gives you the same information. It just doesn't really have a narrative. So you can see right here, here's Cascade River Bridge. It basically has the same information as that bigger sheet that I just showed you.

Commissioner Henley: Okay.

Mr. Jones: And at the end of the spreadsheet it even breaks down the funding more. It breaks down to the bridge project, road project, non-motorized, ferry projects, miscellaneous. It breaks it down by federal, state, local funding. It tells you what's down here, it'll tell you what's secured and what's not, what's planned. Give you totals over on this side here. So if you really want to dig deep into it, I can send you guys that spreadsheet or I can send it to Peter and he can share it. So just let me know and I can send that on.

Commissioner Henley: Just send it to Peter and then we can – he'll distribute it the next time he does a distribution and that'll work fine.

Mr. Jones: All right. Sounds good. Any more questions?

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Hughes, you have a question?

Commissioner Henley: She's muted.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead, Amy. You have to unmute.

Commissioner Hughes: Got it. Forrest, thank you for that overview. I was going to ask the same question. We'd like the latest stuff that's easily to get to. We've got a lot on our plates right now and so the fastest we can get to something would be really nice. Could we go over the County stormwater district projects a little bit? Just show us where we could see it on the maps, and anything you can share regarding that.

Mr. Jones: What? I'm not sure what projects you're talking about.

Commissioner Hughes: Well, I'm not either. It's kind of the first time – I know we've dealt with stormwater, but I don't know as a planning commission if we've ever seen the projects actually coming to life. And so on your map, do you show where those County stormwater district projects are?

Mr. Jones: Yeah, I don't – we don't really cover that in the TIP. I do mostly road projects. I don't know if stormwater's more maintenance.

Mr. Gill: Chair? Chair, this is Peter. The – Commissioner Hughes, if I could jump in just quick: I can get you a map that shows where the proposed projects are for the stormwater division.

Commissioner Hughes: That would be nice. Yeah, I think a few years ago this was in front of us as a Planning Commission as far as the rules and regulations. It'll be real interesting to see it come to life.

Mr. Gill: Yes. Mm-hmm, yeah, and I can get you those project locations. I'll send those out prior to the next meeting.

Commissioner Hughes: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Amy. Any other questions for staff?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, anything else then? Peter?

Mr. Gill: No. That's it from us. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, well, thank you, Forrest, and thank you, Peter, too.

So with that, we'll move on to the Shoreline Master Program Deliberations. What we had discussed at our last meeting, what we embarked upon was to handle first of all the Planning Commission-initiated proposed changes and we've completed that, and we were going to move next to go through the 2016 recommendations as revised by staff. And I'd still like to do that. Is that what you envision tonight, Peter?

Mr. Gill: Sure. Well, we do have a recorded motion and I could easily kind of give us an overview of where we're at and where the 2016 recommendations fall into it and how we got the findings that we do have in there. I could do that if that's helpful.

Chair Raschko: Please do so.

Mr. Gill: Okay. Okay, so here's the draft recorded motion that was sent out as part of your meeting materials. And for the public out there, this is posted also on the Planning Commission Agenda page. The top box is just an overview of the dates and the website. What you do see in here that you didn't see in the last draft were the findings, or draft findings. And you might be surprised with the number of findings in this compared to maybe some of the other recorded motions that you've done. And the process-based findings are quite important, as well as how you all came up with your recommendations. So I am just putting more or less placeholders in here based on topics and themes that have come up through the meetings and the last meeting as well.

Under Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action – these aren't your recommendation. These are basically the whys of, you know, why your recommendations are there. The first four are from the 2016 recorded motion on the findings. Number 5 gets into the dike and drainage questions and issues that have come up during the preceding meetings. Six is human safety regarding docks. Seven had to do with housing and floating homes and floating residences. And then the rest of these are more process-based, right? So this is why things are happening according to certain state laws or rules, what the overall process is or was that started and stopped in 2016 and continued on through 2021. The timing of the staff reports, the public information meetings, the different document publication times and publication dates – all those things that are very process-heavy that could come into question in the future potentially. So it's important that some of these are noted in here.

You'll see there's still some yellow spots where we have to fill in some dates. The second staff report – so we can fill that in now. Deliberation dates are all in here. There's parts of Skagit County Code that require that we have certain findings referring to whether the proposal is supported by a capital facilities plan or a functional plan; whether the proposal is consistent with the Growth Management Act, the Countywide Planning Policies, and the Comprehensive Plan; and whether the proposal bears substantial relationship to public general health, safety, morals, and welfare. So things like that are actually required and in our code that the Planning Commission recommendation contains, and so you'll see findings related to those in here as well.

And then we get to recommendations, right? And so this is where we kind of started last meeting. You'll see the first one in here was also in 2016 to delete the sections regarding the Shoreline Public Access Plan. And what you'll see on the righthand side in the margin is kind of my notes as to whether you all deliberated on this and when the motion was and why it's in there. It also refers back to where in the public comments a certain topic came up. So that helps provide some context to why that recommendation is in there.

So the first – one, two, three – the first 14 are from 2016. So those were recommendations made by the Planning Commission in 2016 and so they are still in here because they are – not necessarily have been incorporated into that existing draft. We did incorporate a lot of the previous 2016 recommendations in there. Those are all removed from this document. The only thing that's left is the ones that were not incorporated. And some of them don't necessarily fit anymore because we did things a little differently than in 2016 with respect at least to critical areas, but we can go through each of these as well. Starting on 15, these items came up either through our work sessions on the public comments or in conversations with – or, I guess, meetings with the

Planning Commission, and so these were Planning Commission-derived recommendations but they were not voted on or no motions to put these in. And so they're very draft and they're kind of a placeholder for you all to discuss.

So this 15 is public access on dikes. This came up in September.

Flood protection and drainage policies – again, came up in September.

Watercraft life canopy construction – light permeable fabric came up through the review of public comments, and that's where you see my notation on the right and the corresponding public comment matrix item that it goes with.

Forest practices: This came up real early in our discussions about access and forest practices within shoreline program – or shoreline jurisdiction, I should say.

Nineteen, twenty, twenty-one came up actually at the last meeting, and you'll see the motion and the date associated with those recommendations.

So now we're getting to the Department recommendations in response to the public comments. You'll see this one here that was removed based on our last meeting. And I'm not going to go through all of these because the rest of them – so 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 through 30: Those are a part of the Department recommendations and so you all can weigh in on your thoughts on those.

So that is the architecture of the recommendation at this point. We can work through the recommendations one by one. We can take them in groups. We can come back to Findings. It's up to you all how you want to go through this.

Chair Raschko: Okay, my initial thought was to go again with the 2016 recommendations, which would be number 1 through 15, I guess. Are there any thoughts on that or any other references? Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Kathy Mitchell: Yes, thank you. Can you hear me okay?

Chair Raschko: Yes.

Commissioner Mitchell: All right, super. I do think we should go – this is important enough – I do think we should go through each one, both for this section and the next section, to make sure that we've got what everybody wants to do.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Anybody else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, then we'll just do that. That means that we are on Recommendations, page 5, number 1. The only problem I'm having here, and I apologize if I'm missing something, but looking at the 2016, number 1 was change shoreline environment designation map as requested with a through b. But here number 1 is to delete SCC 14.26.370 regarding the Shoreline Public Access Plan. So which list are we working on?

Mr. Gill: Yeah, so that is a bit of a difficulty because the numbering has changed because I deleted the removed ones – the ones that were already incorporated into the draft.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Okay, so this is number 2 on the old document. All right. So let's just disregard that old document and we'll go through. Number 1, to delete Skagit County Code 14.26.370 (4)(a) and (b) regarding the Shoreline Public Access Plan. Are there any comments on that?

Commissioner Henley: No.

Chair Raschko: Everybody's fine with that? Rather than voting all of these, why don't we just go for a consensus? If I hear nobody having any problems, then number 1 is just fine.

Commissioner Henley: That's the same as the one we voted on last meeting.

Chair Raschko: Okay. All right, moving to number 2. Remove the content proposed Skagit County Code 14.26.550, additional provisions for fish and wildlife habitat in conservation areas into critical areas. Well, I apologize. Did we vote on all of these? I don't think we got through these.

Commissioner Henley: No, we voted on number 1 and I don't know about – I think some of the previous ones we voted on.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Mr. Gill: Chair, this is Peter. On number 2, I don't – and maybe, you know, Dan or Betsy could weigh in on this, but I don't believe this is necessarily – I don't know, I guess "appropriate's" not the right word. But since we didn't incorporate the critical areas ordinance, I don't think this recommendation applies anymore. I think the previous plan was to incorporate by *reference* the critical areas and remove that whole section into the Shoreline Program instead. And so –

Chair Raschko: So that goes away?

Mr. Gill: I'm not sure.

Dan Nickel: This is Dan. I believe that's correct, Peter. I don't think – I think really this isn't pertinent anymore. Because we have incorporated the critical areas regulations into the body of the Shoreline Master Program, this recommendation isn't pertinent, I don't think.

Betsy Stevenson: I agree.

Commissioner Mitchell: Can I make a motion then?

Chair Raschko: You may.

Commissioner Mitchell: This is Commissioner Mitchell. I move that we strike number 2.

Chair Raschko: Is there a second?

Commissioner Hughes: Commissioner Hughes – I'll second.

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's been moved and seconded to strike number 2. Discussion?

(silence)

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

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, that carries. Thank you. Okay, number 3, Revise proposed Skagit County Code 14.26.415(2)(b)(ii) to read “Ongoing maintenance, harvest, replanting, changing culture techniques or species does not require shoreline review unless cultivating a new species in the water body or using a new culture technique and that new species or culture technique has significant adverse environmental impact if not allowed by an existing shoreline permit.” Okay, any comments?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, are we all fine with that?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Nobody’s opposed? I don’t hear any negatives on that one, so we’ll assume that we have consensus on 3.

Number 4, Revise proposed Skagit County Code 14.26.415 (2)(b)(iii) requires shoreline review, not necessarily a shoreline permit. Does everybody understand that one?

(silence)

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes.

(laughter)

Chair Raschko: Thank you! Peter, can you make a quick explanation?

Mr. Gill: I’m going to ask Betsy or Dan to bring us up to speed with that.

Mr. Nickel: I don’t know, Betsy, if you want to jump in here. I’m not – because I’m not sure what the original intent of this edit was – not being there at the Planning Commission’s deliberations in 2016. So Betsy, if you want to jump in and maybe provide some background there. I think the issue in terms of why the Department is not necessarily recommending this to move forward – or at least for the Department’s recommendation – was that this change represented a – maybe just wasn’t sure if it was necessary. They provide a lot of leeway, I guess, in terms of what staff – for staff discretion, which may be confusing to applicants. So I don’t know, Betsy, if you want to provide any background on that process.

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah, if you'll remember, I think both Bill Dewey and Tim Hyatt came to the meeting when we were talking about this, and we talked about the aquaculture section in some detail. The Planning Commission at that time felt that it made sense to add that language to somewhat clarify and the staff, after reviewing it, didn't really feel like it *did* clarify it and didn't necessarily make it better. And one of the things that I've talked about before as far as the aquaculture section goes is that we had two pretty much diametrically opposed groups represented on the Advisory Committee, and we sat down together and we hammered out the language. And I don't feel comfortable making or recommending changes to that without bringing those guys back into it. So it's certainly your prerogative to do that but I, as the staff person involved, didn't want to support that at this point in time or in 2016 either, so we didn't pick that one up. It didn't really seem to clarify things that much.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Betsy. That's very helpful. Are there any comments from the Planning Commission on this?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a question.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead, Commissioner Woodmansee.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Betsy, are what you're saying is that there can be a process where you're just doing a review in lieu of an actual shoreline permit? That's how I'm reading this.

Ms. Stevenson: Yes.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Is that correct?

Ms. Stevenson: Yes.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So the bottom line is in theory it's – if the circumstance merits it, it's a lesser of a process just going through the review.

Ms. Stevenson: Yes.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. I just wanted to clarify that.

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah, I think what Dan said is true. We are trying to leave it somewhat flexible because we don't know. That industry changes just like the farming industry. You know, we don't want to make it too tight and difficult. We want to make it available for – we'll take a look at it; we'll review it and we'll determine whether they actually need a permit or not based on these different things. So we were trying to keep it a little more open and flexible.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. I thought that's what it was saying but I just wanted to make sure I was reading it right.

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Your comments or questions.

Commissioner Rose: I do. So everything makes sense that Betsy just explained, but what I thought I heard you say is that you're suggesting that we don't include number 4 because the wording that you already had was okay the way it was. Is that what you were just saying?

Ms. Stevenson: Okay, so I was talking about number 3, I think. I'm sorry.

Commissioner Rose: Oh, wait, I meant – that's right. What's on the screen is number 4, but you're right. You were talking about number 3.

Ms. Stevenson: There we go. Sorry about that. Okay. Yeah.

Commissioner Rose: So you're suggesting to not include number 3.

Ms. Stevenson: I wouldn't recommend making the addeds that are proposed that are underlined in number 3.

Commissioner Hughes: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Anybody else?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Just to clarify – this is Woodmansee. My comments were on number 4. Betsy, you were answering my comments as if they were on number 4, correct?

Ms. Stevenson: No! Number 3. I'm sorry. I thought we were still on number 3.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. I guess I thought we were on number 4.

Commissioner Rose: I thought so too. I apologize.

Chair Raschko: Well, I thought we had reached consensus on number 3.

Ms. Stevenson: I apologize then. I guess I'm not keeping up. I didn't hear any kind of an action, so if you didn't take one that means everybody just agreed with the change. I'm sorry.

Chair Raschko: Well, we could do a motion on every one. I thought it was just as easy to have a consensus.

Ms. Stevenson: No, if I just missed it I'm just apologizing for missing it.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so we're on number 4. Okay. We may wish to start over with number 4 because I misinterpreted everything. Is there any background on number 4 that can be provided?

Mr. Nickel: I think I'll let Betsy jump in again too on number 4, but my initial response, I guess, was in relationship to number 4 and so – I mean, I think the intent from staff was that – or the idea here is that we didn't necessarily want to put such an expansion for a non-permitted – existing, non-permitted shoreline activity like this to be just review. So I think that put too much onus on staff, I believe, to make those discretionary decisions. So I think – and Betsy, please, you know, provide some background there if you can – but I think that was the intent of not moving forward with that recommendation.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I didn't understand what you said, Dan. You left me confused. Could you say that again?

Mr. Nickel: Sure, I can try. I mean, I think that provision there is really focused on, you know, aquaculture that doesn't have an existing shoreline permit, right, and the expansion of that activity. And I think from the County's perspective, from the Department's perspective, having that go through a shoreline permit would be appropriate. If you have a review process alone, that might just put too much leeway on County – not leeway, but, you know, too much flexibility for that review process to *not* be under a permit review. And I don't know – Betsy, I think it's probably best if you can maybe explain that decision process back then, but – if I'm stating that correct or not.

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah. I'm sorry. I'm having trouble kind of tracking this. So we're talking about the expansion of existing aquaculture and I'm not sure – it just says to require shoreline review, not necessarily a shoreline permit. So you're basically saying that they shouldn't have to have a shoreline permit for any kind of expansion. I mean, because now we've got _____. I'm not sure exactly where this change is supposed to go or if the comment is just that you want it – you want it to – let's see. Okay, yeah. I don't think that's going to work. I don't think that we would be able to do that under the state standards and guidelines, or we would then be at odds with, I think, the Corps permits and things as well. So what we're doing right now is aligning with the new Corps permits that are coming back for the shellfish aquaculture operations, and they are fairly specific to what people need to do: what areas they're farming; what's being farmed in those areas; what areas they may farm in the future, allowing some areas to lay fallow just like farmers do; all that sort of thing. But it's way more specific and so I'm going to flip over now that we're talking about this one and not the last one, Joe, and I apologize for that. When we're talking about expansion, they need a shoreline permit, not just shoreline review, because they're expanding into an area that hasn't been permitted before. So that's what that looks like.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Anything else?

Ms. Stevenson: You have to look at the heading above that where it talks about expansion of existing aquaculture. That's what we're talking about here. They're actually expanding their use.

Chair Raschko: Okay –

Commissioner Woodmansee: Where does it say "expansion" at? I don't see the word "expansion."

Ms. Stevenson: Okay, under 2-B, sub-item iii, number 3, the title is "Expansion of Existing Aquaculture," and then it goes into "for aquaculture without an existing shoreline permit, a shoreline permit is required for any expansion."

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay, but this comment here's about ongoing maintenance. It doesn't say anything about expansion.

Ms. Stevenson: Okay. This is really hard for me to follow. I'm sorry. I'm looking at a comment in the margin that – it was number A – that you guys made a comment about that – that it requires shoreline review, not necessarily a shoreline permit. And that's – the highlighted one is A for "aquaculture without an existing shoreline permit, a shoreline permit is required for any expansion."

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, and I would think that that would be correct if you're expanding.

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah, and what number 4 in the new one says to me is that you wanted to put in – for aquaculture without an existing, a shoreline *review* is required for any expansion rather than shoreline permits. And that's just not going to work in this number A.

Chair Raschko: Okay, does anybody care to make a motion to strike number 4?

Commissioner Hughes: Chair, point of order, if I could. This is Amy Hughes.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead.

Commissioner Hughes: It seems to me that we have bounced back into the 2016 recommendations, but we've been so busy with the latest ones that this is fairly new information for our thought processes, and it's really difficult for me to try to remember 2016 – what happened, what was said. And I think staff is having the same. Would it be possible to deal with the recommendations that we've been dealing with now and then maybe give us another time to go back and study the 2016 and catch up with what recommendations were made and why staff – what their thoughts are? Would there be another way to tackle this, is what I'm asking.

Chair Raschko: I think that – I think everybody's struggling. And I think one of the struggles that I'm having is that bouncing between the code and these numbers, it's really difficult to fully appreciate what the subject at hand even *is*. So I like your recommendation. My understanding of Robert's Rules is I can decide on your point of order, and I would agree. I would agree that we should go ahead and move on to the section that deals with changes that are the result of public input, which would be – is that number 21? Peter, do you know what number that would be?

Mr. Gill: Yes. So if we pop down to – are you looking for the ones that came – not the 2016, but still the Planning Commission recommendations?

Chair Raschko: I thought we had handled the Planning Commission recommendations.

Mr. Gill: Well, not quite yet. So the number 15 comes down to some of the comments. So 15, 16, and 17 and 18 are items that the Planning Commission has not weighed in on and that are new to this draft.

Chair Raschko: All right, let's start with 15.

Mr. Gill: Okay.

Chair Raschko: I apologize to everybody for the struggle that we've been having, and I thank you, Amy, for your point of order. So let's go ahead with 15. "Public access on dikes must be agreeable to the applicant and the process to determine feasibility should be written into the regulations," in SMP section 14.26.353(d). Clarify new and existing dock maintenance. Peter, do you want to give some background, please?

Mr. Gill: Sure. Yeah, so I believe Commissioner Hughes brought this up in September regarding public access to the different dikes, and I believe there was a conversation between Planning Commission members regarding, you know, what was the process and making sure that it was agreeable to not – to the applicant, as far as what public access looked like. And so that section

14.26.350, I believe, has to do with the public access section. And I'll double-check that at the moment.

Ms. Stevenson: Public Access is 370, isn't it?

Mr. Nickel: That is actually correct. There's a – that cross-reference there for 360 should be actually section 370.

Mr. Gill: Okay, 370.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Does anybody care to comment on 15?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a question.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead, Commissioner Woodmansee.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Is there a possibility that the applicant could possibly not be the property owner in this situation? And if so, I'm trying to figure out how that – if it could be, then we want to make sure that the property owner would have to be agreeable to the process as well as an applicant, if they're not one and the same.

Commissioner Hughes: I support that – sorry. Commissioner Hughes – I would support the word “applicant” needs to be clarified.

Chair Raschko: Any comments from staff?

Mr. Gill: Yeah, this is Peter. To the applicant and the landowner? It could be different language. I'm not sure if that addresses Commissioner Woodmansee's concern.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, it certainly gets the landowner into the mix. And I'm just looking at that – say, hypothetically, a planning department made application to a state agency for some sort of a grant to provide public trails. And so in the wording here, at the very high service I could see the property owner being left out of the feasibility process of this and/or the agreeable process of it. And Betsy can straighten me out if that's not even something that could happen, but I just thought it should be specific that the public access on dikes, whoever controls those dikes needs to be involved in that. And sometimes an applicant's not the actual property owner or controller.

Ms. Stevenson: That's true. What we're talking about in the public access section is if somebody comes in – whoever it may be – with a proposed development that under what we're talking about in this section they would be required to do some sort of public access and provide some sort of public access. Usually it's a public entity that we're talking about. Not always, but normally. But I think regardless of who we're talking about we are not going to go out and require that in an area that somebody who is the landowner isn't going to give right-of-entry or any of – I mean, it has to be an agreement from all the parties, and that's how it's worked everywhere, especially when we're talking about dikes. So all the parties have to agree and it has to be spelled out what that means and what kind of access we're talking about because they're not going to want horses and things on their – on the tops of their dikes usually, and all that sort of stuff. So the actual use and, you know, that it's probably non-motorized – all that kind of things – pedestrian traffic, maybe bicycles – although sometimes you run into trouble if you get too many things out happening in a

place. Who's going to maintain it? Is that going to be up to the landowner or is it going to be the person – I mean, there's a lot of things that would have to be involved in that agreement.

Chair Raschko: Any other comments?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: I've got one. The way this is written, when it says "must be agreeable to the applicant/slash/property owner," to me that's ambiguous. It can be one or the other, so it's not all-inclusive. I wonder if it should – or just say "all parties, including property owner"? Are there any comments on that?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I can support that. My whole thing is I just want to make sure whoever the property owner is has a pretty good say in the discussion.

Commissioner Mitchell: Could you repeat it for me, please?

Chair Raschko: Well, I was proposing it to say "must be agreed of all parties including the property owner."

Unidentified male voice (muffled): And for inclusion of the applicant.

Chair Raschko: I'm sorry. Somebody else had something?

Commissioner Rose: I just said I would agree with that.

Commissioner Mitchell: It sounds fine to me too. This is Mitchell.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Anything else on 15?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: What's everybody's pleasure? Do you want to have a motion on each of these or just figure we have consensus and move on?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I'm fine with consensus and moving on.

Chair Raschko: All right. Let's move on. Number 16 includes a statement about flood protection and drainage in policies. "The SMP should contain a statement on unique role of the dike and drainage special districts in Skagit County and their relevance to shorelines. Add to 6C-1.4" Okay, Peter, do you have any illumination on this?

Mr. Gill: Sure. This came up at the same meeting as public access did. And it had to do with recognizing the importance of the diking and drainage districts to Skagit County and the uniqueness of our situation here. I believe this came from Commissioner Hughes.

Chair Raschko: Amy, any comments on 16?

Commissioner Hughes: This is Commissioner Hughes. I'd like to follow up on this. My studying today took me to the staff report. Would it be considered a staff report from Betsy? And I think

she addressed this in some recommendations. Betsy, on your staff report, page 8, did we cover this as far as an agreement just this last week as far as writing?

Ms. Stevenson: Sorry.

Commissioner Hughes: Yeah, we're bouncing around. Let me – "The Department" – I'm going to read on page 8: "The Department recommends the following addition to" – if I've got my numbers right – "section 14.26.130 to read" and then ___ as provided in RCW.

Ms. Stevenson: I was just looking at the screen and now it's gone. It was on flood protection? What was on the screen? No?

Commissioner Hughes: I put it – it'd be right above your bold "next steps."

Ms. Stevenson: Sorry. Yeah, it's at the very bottom where we changed it. Yes. For Applicability? That's where we added it.

Commissioner Hughes: Yeah.

Ms. Stevenson: So, yes. Sorry! Thank you, Amy. I'm still back on the other one because I can't find the code reference that we're changing because I don't think it's in there. So I'm sorry.

Commissioner Hughes: No, and it's just for – I was studying today so – but I think that this is the wording that we're looking for –

Ms. Stevenson: Yes.

Commissioner Hughes: (unintelligible)

Ms. Stevenson: Yes. Thank you. Yes, I think Commissioner Kathy Mitchell asked at the last meeting about the conversations with the Drainage and Irrigation Consortium. So we had that conversation and this is what they asked for, and I suggested that it go in the Applicability section because that's where it fits. So that's what we recommended to do to take care of the situation and the comment. And that was their recommended wording. It basically acknowledges that they do have powers and authority for doing the work that they do and that this program doesn't affect their ability to do that work.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Stevenson: Can I ask for some clarification, and I apologize, but the further we get from it the harder it's going to be.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Ms. Stevenson: Going back to the prior one that you just worked on – number 15? I don't find that in the document anymore. So I'm – it seems as though we're changing something that isn't even in here and so I'm having trouble. I don't know. I'm looking at section 370 and I just don't see it. So I apologize but...

Chair Raschko: Really? Okay.

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah.

Mr. Nickel: I think it's in section 350.

Ms. Stevenson: Is it in 350 rather than 370? Okay.

Mr. Nickel: Correct. 350 has a reference that –

Ms. Stevenson: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Nickel: – the current public review draft has a reference to section 360. It should have been section 370. That was the error.

Ms. Stevenson: Okay, thank you. Sorry! This is just really hard for me.

Mr. Nickel: This is pointing to section 350.

Ms. Stevenson: Okay. Alrighty.

Mr. Nickel: The Flood Hazard section.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so we're back to 16. Is everybody agreeable to 16?

Commissioner Hughes: I have one more point to make, if possible. Could we capitalize "dike and drainage districts," the three Ds, since that *is* a title? On 17.

Ms. Stevenson: It isn't if you don't number them – just to be – I don't know.

Commissioner Hughes: Oh, really? Okay.

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah, when you're just talking in general of dike and drainage districts, it's not a title. But when it's dike and drainage irrigation district number such-and-such, that *is* their title. This is the exact way that Jenna wrote it, and so I would disagree with you on that one. We're talking about them in general rather than as a specific title.

Commissioner Hughes: Okay, and I'll follow that. It's just I'm used to seeing them capitalized. So okay.

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah, when it comes with a number they definitely are.

Commissioner Hughes: So the statement in 16 right above it?

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah. True enough! We should be consistent, so I'll go back and look and see what's consistent. Thanks, Amy.

Commissioner Hughes: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay. All right, so 17 just came from where?

Mr. Gill: Yeah. Chair, this is Peter. That was pulled out of the staff report. Commissioner Hughes referred to this one from the staff report.

Chair Raschko: Okay. So is everybody good with the collective number 16 and 17? Any more comments?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. If not, we'll assume everybody's agreeable and move on to what is now 18, Remove requirement in Table 14.26.420-1 for watercraft lift canopies to be constructed of light permeable fabric. Comments, please.

Commissioner Mitchell: I have a comment. This is Mitchell.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead, Kathy.

Commissioner Mitchell: I'd like to see that number – now number 18 – stay, please.

Chair Raschko: Does anybody feel differently?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, I think this is one that we had talked about to some extent, and if nobody else feels differently from the recommendation of Commissioner Mitchell, we will do as she asked and leave it as is. Okay?

Number 19, Forest practices that are not intended for conversion to other uses consistent with SCC 14.26.455(1) should be allowed to temporary access roads without a shoreline substantial development permit. I have a question on this one. Having been involved in such things, the wording is confusing to me. It should be allowed to temporary access roads. What does that mean? Allowed to what? Does it mean to construct them or to use or what?

Mr. Gill: So Chair, this is Peter. This – just to provide some context – this came into the conversation regarding access to the timberlands, so I think the issue was you were allowed to cut within shoreline jurisdiction but you weren't allowed to develop the roads to get the timber without the substantial development permit. And so that's what this is intending to address. And so the word – the specific wording is not necessarily crafted quite right so we need to work through that.

Chair Raschko: Yeah, I would recommend saying you should be allowed to construct temporary access roads. And there can be some requirement too to properly abandon them when the timber harvest is finished.

Commissioner Mitchell: I concur.

Commissioner Rose: And what would construe a temporary road versus a permanent road? Is there a reason to get specific about that?

Chair Raschko: The construction standards would be quite differently, and I would think that in a shoreline type of area you would probably be required to do your operation in the summer, and in the summer then you might be able to really make a minimal road with minimal rock – again because you're in the dry time – and have a much easier time, you know, removing that temporary destruction and putting it back to nature, so to speak. Whereas if you were building a permanent

road, you would have a couple feet of rock as to subgrade and then a surfacing rock and culverts and ditches and a lot of other things. Does that help?

Commissioner Rose: Yes, it does, and I'm looking at this number 19 and I'm thinking that despite the fact that it wouldn't need a substantial development permit – shoreline – it would still have a permit that would then review that road and make that qualification that it would be done in the summer, like you're talking about. Is that correct?

Chair Raschko: I believe this would be overseen by the Department of Natural Resources and they can condition the thing and put, you know, seasonal limits and even have you shut down if it rains.

Commissioner Rose: I see. Yeah, that makes sense. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: I mean, it's one of the more highly regulated things you can do in the state of Washington.

Ms. Stevenson: So I think road building is considered part of the forest practice, at least in the definitions that the Department of Ecology is using. The only thing that doesn't require the shoreline permit and review is the actual cutting of the tree itself, anything else that has to do with it. This section applies to forest practices, meaning "any activity conducted on or directly pertaining to forest land and relating to growing, harvesting, or processing timber. It doesn't apply to a forest practice that only involves timber cutting, is not a development under the Shoreline Management Act and this SMP, and does not require a shoreline substantial development permit or a shoreline exemption." Construction of that temporary road *would* require something from us.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Betsy, so what you're saying is what's being proposed here can't be done.

Ms. Stevenson: I'm not saying that it can't be done. I just want you to be aware of what the requirements are because you may end up getting overturned. We kind of had some discussions with the Department of Ecology as well. And so I –

Commissioner Woodmansee: I mean, in my view –

Ms. Stevenson: A road building in the shoreline area, whether it's temporary or permanent, would still require a substantial development permit.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So in my view, if you do some sort of a temporary access you're probably going to have less damage to the area because you've done something to protect it while you're harvesting, whereas if you don't have that access and you're harvesting and you're having problems, you're going to move from one spot to the next to try to get the harvest out. And so it seems to me like to be – we need to be able to do this, but what you're saying is if you're going to do any kind of a road it's going to require a shoreline substantial development permit. Correct?

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah.

Chair Raschko: It's an interesting situation because when you're harvesting timber, first of all if you're going to be in a place where it's shoreline involved you're probably on flat ground, right? And so you can probably have ground-based yarding systems, and that means having a heavy

machine dragging logs over the ground all over the place. If you can't get a road in, then you haul them all the way to where you *can* have a road. And I understand my argument – that it doesn't hold water because of the requirements, you know, of other places in the law, but in my opinion it'd still be less damaging to be able to build the road.

So anyway, okay. Being what staff has said, it looks like we should strike number 19. Is there any agreement to that?

Commissioner Woodmansee: There are some comments in the Chat also, Chair.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Well, we've got – oh, Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes, thank you. Well, you know this wouldn't be the first time that we made a recommendation because we wanted to let them know what we thought was the best thing and what would be a good idea. And in the past, there *have* been some good successes with having dialogue with the Department – *our* staff department, but also the big department – Ecology. And, you know, this could be another one of those. I would prefer to leave the language in asking for it with the reasons why, and if they feel so strongly that it's an absolute zero they'll come back and tell us.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Commissioner Rose?

Commissioner Rose: Thank you. You partially answered my question with your explanation that perhaps getting the logs out would do more damage than building a road. And I can understand that. Is there some argument about what defines building a road? Like, for example, if you do this in the summer and you use hot fuel, is that considered a road? Does that solve the problem? In other words, you're the logger, or that's your background, so maybe you can elaborate a little bit more about that.

Chair Raschko: I don't think you'd want to use _____. There is a thing called **punching**, where you actually lay small logs crosswise across where the road is to be and cover that with rock, and when you're done you pick it all back up again. That might be a good thing in this case because it's done mostly when you're on soft soils or your rope-building material might just sink into the top layers of the soil. I don't know if that answers the question or not.

Commissioner Rose: It helps to know what – you know, to understand it more broadly about what are different approaches to tackle the problem. So I guess I would go along with Commissioner Mitchell's suggestion that we leave it in there just for the purpose of discussion so that – because I hadn't thought about the logs with the rock over the top that then gets removed. I wouldn't have thought about that before.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Hughes?

Commissioner Hughes: I'd like to just follow up on that conversation to put it in there just for an idea for a thought process to begin. At one point, the Department of Natural Resources was also brought in – the DNR – and so it seems to me that we have agencies that could work together and come up with maybe a solution to all of this. So I would say I would support leaving it in just so we could get a conversation going.

Chair Raschko: Okay, are there any thoughts otherwise? We seem to have opinions that we leave it in. Unless somebody brings up a reason not to do so, then why don't we leave number 19 as it's been amended here? All right?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, we'll move on to number 20: Maintenance of public access should not be the financial responsibility of the landowner. Who would like to talk to this?

Mr. Gill: Sure, so just – I can talk to it, but the next three were part of your deliberation last week and so you all have already, you know, passed a motion to include these next three.

Chair Raschko: Yes, I do recall. Okay. So that puts us at 20 – well, can you scroll down a little bit, please?

Mr. Gill: Sure. Yep. So this takes us into the next set. These are the Department-recommended changes that we all discussed through the public comment workshops. So we can go through these if you like.

Chair Raschko: Yeah, let's do so.

Commissioner Mitchell: Excuse me. Can I have a question first before we go that direction? This is Commissioner Mitchell.

Chair Raschko: Yes, go ahead, please.

Commissioner Mitchell: So the next section is more what the Department had recommended. Is that correct?

Mr. Gill: Yes.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay, can I ask to do a hand count for back to see if there's any more Planning Commission recommendations before we move on? Because I had a couple of notes myself from last week that we didn't hit then or now, and I was wondering if anybody else had any comments on the same sections. So if you can just check to see if anybody else has anything else.

Chair Raschko: Thank you for bringing that up, Kathy. Has anybody else any other recommendations?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a comment about setbacks on an established – like a Cavanaugh kind of a situation or even Big Lake – that I wouldn't mind just bringing back up. I don't think it's going to go anywhere but I do want to get on the record my thoughts.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, I know Betsy will do a good job of reminding me and saying why this can't be, but I guess the core of my issue that I have is that when you have a shoreline that's, you know, largely developed – 90%, 95; in a particular section you might be, you know, 98% developed in a given section – and because of changing codes and stuff like that, the setbacks are drastically different for, say, a single or one or two remaining lots compared to

everybody else on that stretch. I guess I just want to go on the record saying that I think that Skagit County should hold the rule of an average of the neighboring properties and that that should rule our building setback – assuming that you're not literally in a wetland or a critical area itself. And so my concern is that you have one lot, you've got ten houses on each side of it, and that one lot's going to sit 100 feet back or 150 or whatever it might be, and everybody else is 40 feet off the shoreline. And I don't think it meets the fairness doctrine, which is a made-up term – it's not a made-up term but I'm making it up for the sake of my conversation – because it's a real term! But I just don't think it's right and I don't think that there's the public benefit for that one lot restriction to make enough of a difference to cause that what I consider harm to the property owner as far as the usability of their property.

I would love to see our setbacks on these types of situations fall back to the average of so many feet each way of a given lot. I just think it's a fair thing and it has more to do with fairness than it has to do with anything else. But at the same time, I don't think that the minimal impact in the – you know, I'm sure that this falls under, you know, Best Available Science, which to me is – I think that it can be debated, you know, a lot of different ways, that particular term. But I like – I just want to go on the record saying that I think that the setbacks should be an averaged-out setback – like I've said three times now so I'll quit saying it. So that's my comment on setbacks. And I'm sure Betsy'll straighten me out, but I just want to be on the record saying that.

Ms. Stevenson: I won't straighten you out but I'll just let you know what the code says now as far as using the average setback of residences within 300 feet.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay.

Ms. Stevenson: That actually was put into play to protect people who were set back quite a bit further rather than to allow people to move closer, because then you're required a minimum setback. So the way it's written now in most of our shoreline areas that are along the lakes that are fairly, you know, small lots and heavily developed, it says your setback is 50 feet or the average of the residences within 300 feet of your side property line, whichever's greater. So you never get to go less than whatever your standard is, if that makes sense. So the way it's written now, you truly are like somebody who sits back 150 feet – you take that average into consideration so this person could have to be further back than that 50-foot, which would be the minimum setback requirement. So we've never had anything where we allowed people to get closer because everybody else was closer. They still had to stay the minimum 50 feet. They might have to actually go further back if people have set further back when they built their homes.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So I think what you're saying is that what I'm saying should be, actually is the case. Is it based on the average?

Ms. Stevenson: No. What I'm saying is that –

Commissioner Woodmansee: I mean, I get the 50-foot minimum. I get that.

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah, okay, because you're indicating that they should be able to be closer. If everybody else is closer they should be wherever anybody else is, and that's the exact opposite of why we put this into play. It's actually –

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah.

Ms. Stevenson: – to protect people who set further back. So you never get to go – like if the average setback is 25 feet, you have to stay at least 50. You don't get to go to that 25.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, and so I think I may have – I thought the – I'm good with the average concept and I thought that that had went away.

Ms. Stevenson: No. It's in the existing Shoreline Program but it is proposed to not be there now because we're integrating the critical areas ordinance with the Shoreline Program, so it's one setback, one buffer – whatever. So it *is* proposed to go away.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. So I'm going to take it a step farther and I'd make a motion that we don't take that away.

Commissioner Mitchell: I second the motion.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded to recommend that the setback average ___ not go away. Was there discussion?

Commissioner Hughes: I have a question and comment. Amy Hughes.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Commissioner Hughes: When I've studied this, I felt it had to do with *new* developments and I put it into my mental map that a lot of our lakes and shorelines have already been developed and it wouldn't apply to necessarily every model. I know there's some other rules – Betsy, clarify me – if you're remodeling. But what I'm thinking is if there's a new piece of property on a shoreline that's going to be developed in ten lots or four lots, that everyone would equally have to go back to the critical areas. So I could see it in our – so help me, Betsy, how it actually reads because I was reading it with new developments.

Ms. Stevenson: You say it that way, it sounds like you're swearing at me! So help me, Betsy! You sound like my mother!

Commissioner Hughes (laughing): I sounded like your mother! No, it was truly: Please help me, Betsy!

Ms. Stevenson: Well, I think you're on to something. I think your thought process probably makes sense. The other thing that I would just add – Joe, I'm not going to argue with you. I know where you're coming from and I get it. I don't think it's going to fly for us but that doesn't mean you guys can't put it in there. Because our critical areas buffers are bigger, those are going to get larger anyway. So it's not going to be 50 feet anymore. It's probably going to be a bigger number. It depends on the shoreline area and what type of a critical area it is. But I would say that even that new development, they can apply for a variance and they can do the administrative variance or the full-blown hearing examiner variance or they can ask for a small modification of the buffer. But what we do end up getting is some native vegetation along that shoreline so you actually can have some benefit, even though it may not be much and, you know, it's a small section at a time it's something. And we need to start showing some benefit from the Shoreline Program rules and things that we're putting into play as far as habitat loss and function and value loss of those critical areas and things. So I guess I would say it sounds great. I understand what you're saying. And you're wanting to be fair because the other people have been there for so long and now this person, you feel, is being penalized because they haven't developed their lot yet and now they're

expected to do something different. So you have to start somewhere, I guess, is just all I would say. And, you know, we need to start getting some vegetated areas along our shorelines. So I would take it from the other perspective. Otherwise, we're never going to make any headway if we don't start turning things a little bit now. And we are going to be held accountable in our Shoreline Program. We're going to have to start monitoring some of these things and make sure that we *are* meeting the no net loss piece, which we talked about a long, long time ago. You know, we have that baseline now that was developed from all the studies and all the work that Dan did early on in the process, and we have to make sure that we're getting some net gain out of everything. And if we keep slipping in areas and letting things happen, we're not going to get there. So just food for thought. I don't know if that helped or not.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Betsy. Any other comments on the motion? Commissioner Mitchell, did you have something?

Commissioner Mitchell: No, I put my request in for a comment for what's after this before I knew we were going to do this. I'm ready to go for the motion if you are.

Chair Raschko: All right. Peter, could you please read the motion?

Mr. Gill: Sure, and I'm showing it on the screen here. The Planning Commission recommends the setback averaging provision not be removed from the proposed SMP.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Ms. Stevenson: So I think I would clarify that, Peter. It's not in the proposed SMP.

Commissioner Woodmansee: It'd be from the existing.

Ms. Stevenson: It's in the existing SMP. So you can leave it like that! They won't get what they want.

Mr. Gill: I see. So that setback averaging provision would be added to the proposed SMP. Is that – is that more to what this should say?

Ms. Stevenson: Basically I think it was a motion to leave the setback average provision in the SMP as it currently exists. Yeah.

Mr. Gill: How's that?

Chair Raschko: Does that fit what you want, Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, it does. And, you know, I just – I want to say this. I would love to see this stay and I won't be offended if it doesn't, and I do believe that new development – like creating new lots – is a different category, but I think existing lots are their own category in my mind. But I appreciate the dialog on it and we'll see where we go here.

Chair Raschko: All right. All those in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Aye. Okay, were there any opposed?

Commissioner Rose: I'm opposed.

Commissioner Hughes: I'm opposed.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so we have Commissioner Hughes and Commissioner –

Commissioner Rose: Rose.

Chair Raschko: Rose. Any abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, that passes. Thank you. Okay, Commissioner Mitchell, did you have some proposals?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes, I do. Thank you. From my notes from last week into this week, I just want to clarify with Betsy: So the floodplain mapping errors/acknowledgments are being taken care of differently than our having to acknowledge it in our recommendations. Is that correct?

Ms. Stevenson: No. I'm not following you. What are we talking about?

Commissioner Mitchell: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, I'm doing Kathy-speak, not everybodyelse-speak. The mapping errors that the dike and drainage and farm district folks brought up, and in the comments that – and was in our matrixes, I think you – I believe you guys had said that comments were noted. And then you've had some meetings with the folks about some of that stuff. And I think what I'm stumbling around saying is that the maps are still in error on how they exist – like landward of the tidegates and those kinds of things. Is it such that we should – if we feel strongly about it, we should make a recommendation here so it's stated for a reminder to get those things corrected, or is it such that it's such an ongoing thing that staff deals with it on a one-by-one basis?

Ms. Stevenson: Okay, thank you! I'm with you now. I apologize. I guess I'm just a little slow tonight. But anyway, yeah, we've had some conversations with them about their recommended changes on those four areas. There seems to be some agreement. There are some areas that are associated wetlands, even upstream of the tidegates, which would still necessarily identify them as within shoreline jurisdiction for that reason. There also are areas – just because there's a tidegate there doesn't necessarily mean that automatically stops shoreline jurisdiction. You almost have to go out and do a site-by-site, case-by-case – some detailed work. We've done it before. You have to go out and look at the vegetation and see how far up from that tidegate it's still saltwater-tolerant or when it starts becoming more of a freshwater vegetation kind of area. We've also had to do some salinity tests on the water and see how far up it goes 'til it's not, you know, necessarily saltwater as much. It's still mixed, but where you get enough of the interaction so it's – Dan had some more conversation with Jenna from the Drainage and Irrigation Consortium. So they are working on some data sets and some information that might be helpful and useful, but we don't have that information so we don't have anything right now that would allow us to say, Oh, well, what we have is an error. This is new information that we can use to change that. So I kind of feel like we need to stay where we are and continue those discussions and dialogs, and maybe even almost to the point where we can start going out and doing some of that work in the field and just taking a look at what's there and what that looks like, and so that we can help them identify those areas that we would still probably consider shoreline areas before it gets to the point of them having work to do.

The other thing that I need to keep reminding them, too, is that if they're doing normal maintenance work and any kind of repair work on their dikes and ditches, that falls under exemptions all over the place in the Shoreline Program so it wouldn't necessarily affect them. But if they're proposing new projects where they're building new dikes or doing some new work that isn't covered under normal maintenance and repair – it's brand new and there isn't anything there right now, or they're raising the dikes quite a bit higher, more than just to level them off, and where they've sort of sunk or had some damage done to them. So I think we can continue the discussion and there's always the opportunities for us to make amendments between our periodic reviews, but by the time we get this one done it'll probably be just about time for another periodic review to start thinking about. And then – so we'll keep working closely with them and make sure that we're addressing their issues. And Dan, if you want to say some more – you're the one that had the conversation with Jenna – please feel free.

Mr. Nickel: I think you hit on it very well, Betsy. Really the point being, the maps – there's potential inaccuracies in a lot of areas in the maps. The maps are indicative of where shoreline jurisdiction is, it's indicative of where wetlands are, where we have a variety of different data. And one of the things we discussed, you know, with our discussions with Jenna was that what's on the ground at the time of a development is going to be what the County permits from. And so, you know, if there's an inaccuracy now that we know may be fixed in years to come, if they come in for a development application tomorrow there will be site-specific investigations done at that time that will clarify that then and there. So it – you know, the maps we have are indicative of where things are and what, you know, environmental conditions are out there but it doesn't necessarily – it's not what gets permitted from. What gets permitted from is based on what's on the ground.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay, so in other words – if I state this wrong, just say so – so in other words, if I were to suggest putting language in saying that the maps should be – recommend that the maps should be fixed and updated where known to be in error now, then that really is not going to happen – is really what the gist is, right?

Mr. Nickel: We don't have that information yet. I mean, I think that's what Jenna was saying was that that information is coming but we don't have that at this time yet. Correct.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay. Thank you. The second question for you guys – I had three things from last time and I think Commissioner Woodmansee hit on my number third. The second one I need help on, Betsy and Dan, both of you guys, and everybody: Back to the Lake Cavanaugh examples and the Big Lake examples, what I've got written here is the dock height was 1½-foot clearance above the ordinary high water line should not apply to Lake Cavanaugh since the water height varies so much. And when reading through all those documents, it was clear that the Cavanaugh people probably had the worst situation. Big Lake has some of the situation. I don't think we know where other places are having those kinds of situations. But why can't we address that? Why can't we address those lakes or those bodies where they do have big fluctuations instead of making it a one-size-fits-all?

Ms. Stevenson: I think one of the ways that you do that is by the design of your dock, because they have much larger fluctuations on marine shoreline areas with the tides and things. So I think it depends on if you do feel like you're having a big fluctuation then maybe more of it is floating rather than stationary. So I think there are ways to address that within the standards without changing the height requirement.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay. Are there any boaters here to address this? I've not been a big enough boater to be able to address it very well. But I was concerned about the situation for those kinds of lake people.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Living at Big Lake, I don't think there's very many docks that would meet this foot-and-a-half thing. If I was going to guess, the ordinary high water mark – not, you know, the *extreme* high water – I'm not so sure that most of the docks would need a fair amount higher than the foot-and-a-half above. But I have not went out and measured any of them. But just looking across the lake, I mean, most docks – I mean, I know mine goes under water every – if we have a wet year at all, mine's inundated with water, as are the neighbors'. But it seems like there's a lot more – to the ordinary water mark, it seems like docks are typically higher than a foot-and-a-half from the ordinary high water mark at Big Lake. I haven't been to Cavanaugh to look at docks out there at all. So I'm not sure where the number came from either or if it's, you know, out of a state code or something. I don't know. Go ahead.

Commissioner Mitchell: Does anybody know, can anybody tell me when these things are measured? And I know from experience before when we were out on Guemes Island, some people were dismayed at what time of year something was done when calling something "flooded" when it was very like we're having right now: A deluge of rain in a little low spot ends up being a puddle and they call it a wetland. Well, you know, if you look at the ordinary high water mark for some of these lakes that fluctuate, when is that measured and how is it measured? You know, because it *would* make a difference. And so I guess what I'm looking for is help with some kind of language to address those situations because they do exist. Not everybody can build a new dock. Does anybody have any ideas?

Mr. Nickel: I would say just for the definition of an ordinary high water mark that is something that is based on physical characteristics. You know, based on vegetation, based on substrates and shoreline conditions. But it tends to be somewhere where water is present for at least a couple of weeks out of the year to really affect the vegetative community. That's kind of maybe a general rule of thumb. So if a lake fluctuates and it come up for a couple of days and drops back down, that may not impact the vegetative community, but if it comes up and stays flooded and it affects vegetation and how it grows and that repeats, you know, year after year in a typical situation, that may be something will affect the physical characteristics along the edge of the shoreline to really kind of draw a line in the sand per se – of where that ordinary high water mark might be.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Betsy, it seems to me like the ordinary high water mark is usually measured via vegetation line for the most part, but it's – and it takes a lot more than a couple of weeks to eliminate the vegetation of water. I don't know, you know – I mean, I'm sure that the County's not going to go out and start measuring everybody's ordinary high water marks. But I will say that most docks – I would envision that most docks are higher than 1½ feet above the ordinary high water existing. So is that a change? Is this a change, that foot-and-a-half, or has that already been there?

Ms. Stevenson: I have to look. I don't remember that we have that in our current code. But the other thing I guess I would say to Kathy's comment: We're not going to make people change their docks. If somebody's building a new dock, it would have to be to the new standard. They can still do normal maintenance and repair to their existing docks. If they end up having to replace the whole thing, then it would have to come under probably the new standard. But let me look real quick. Sorry you can hear me flipping pages.

Commissioner Mitchell: That's all right. I kick myself for not writing down the page numbers myself. I thought I would remember and I don't. I'm sorry.

Ms. Stevenson: "Docks shall not exceed three feet in height above the ordinary high water mark on a landward side" is what's in the existing code.

Commissioner Woodmansee: If I was going to guess, I would say that most docks are somewhere between that foot-and-a-half and the three-foot now – if I was going to guess. Just, you know, from what I can see. Just for informational purposes.

Ms. Stevenson: Your knowledge is helpful.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Betsy, do you know if that's measured to the underside or the topside?

Ms. Stevenson: Good question. No.

Mr. Nickel: That is to the underside of the dock.

Ms. Stevenson: Thank you. Thank you.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, that's helpful.

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah, thank you.

Commissioner Woodmansee: For sure.

Commissioner Mitchell: Well, if – can I throw out another question while Betsy's looking, just in general? Again, does it look to anybody else like the language could be better somehow?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: No comments?

Commissioner Hughes: I'll make a comment. This is Amy Hughes. I'm looking at the clock and our thought processes, and maybe this is something we could take to the next meeting with more information from everybody?

Chair Raschko: Well, yeah. We don't seem to be going anywhere. How do people feel about it? It might be a good stopping point if this is the last of the Planning Commissioner-originated proposed changes. The next time we can move on to the public comment-proposed changes. So it's a good point to do that. Is everybody else getting a little worn out?

(affirmative sounds)

Commissioner Woodmansee: It's been a long day.

Chair Raschko: Well, I apologize to all because I've been really under the weather and I've been struggling in this meeting, so please understand. Commissioner Mitchell, how do you feel about that?

Commissioner Mitchell: Oh, I'm fine with letting Betsy look up a little more information for us and let's revisit this next time and be able to move on ___ fresh. It's fine with me.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Are there any last comments/questions of staff or the Commission on this subject?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Well, okay. Thank you, Commissioner Hughes, for your recommendation. Why don't we then move on to the Director's Update? Please.

Hal Hart: Thank you, Commissioners. Great job this evening, by the way, watching you go through this and doing _____. Very good. So we have a quick Director's Update. Let's go to the next one. That'd be great. Thanks, Peter. I just like to give you updates.

This focus this month is we've got a lot of activity in the agricultural industry right now, and as we look at growth to the north and the south, all directions around us, I think it's important to remind everybody Hey, what's going on locally? We have at least two potato sheds coming in. These are big – usually 30,000 square feet or larger. There are other things as well. We have a distillery – Westland – and I also kind of checked into Hey, who owns Westland? Who's the parent company? And we are global in our food industry these days. So kind of the parent company of Westland, which is a Seattle area brand, based there and, you know, great people out of Seattle, is Remy Cointreau, a French company, that owns many brands. So it's kind of interesting.

Chuckanut Brewing is local.

Sakata Seed obviously has international roots.

Vikima – I forgot about this. This is Denmark, a Danish company. So seed production – these are really important worldwide, and we are connected to the rest of the world right here in the Skagit Valley too.

West Coast Reduction. This is a new one. We just finished the SEPA about this one. This is bringing biofuels in and they'll onload and offload those here. They're coming in from other places so it's another investment in our industrial kind of area but it is ag-based.

And then, again, the Co-op is local, banding together to help local farmers there.

Lots of other investments. I'm highlighting these. Let's go to the next one. This year in November the Commissioners and I are going to be gathering with all the other 39 other – 38 other county planning directors in November and we are going to be looking at these kinds of things: Growth Management legislation; salmon recovery legislation; climate change legislation. All of it will impact us in one way or another. You know, climate change, one of the biggest things in climate change will probably be sea level rise, and what do we do about that going forward? Salmon recovery is kind of the significant issue which we are busy, you know, working to look at Seattle City Light and those kinds of things from our perspective and from the tribal perspective here in Skagit County. But there will be some state legislative changes as well. And we're not sure what the Growth Management legislation changes will be. They are setting up technical advisory committees to discuss that, and probably will be looking at some of the things that we've talked about historically – Areas of More Intense Rural Development, like Clear Lake and Edison, and

what are the rules going forward there? They'll probably look at housing and what Cities are supposed to be doing about that and there'll probably be other spinoffs.

The other thing just coming up is there have been a lot of new articles that have been appearing – I can send some of them to you – about growth of high tech. What does that mean when south of us they're adding, you know, 25,000 jobs in Bellevue and 40,000 jobs overall in the last four years in high tech? What's that mean to our – you know, along the I-5 corridor?

Let's go to the next one. Migration is once again the primary driver – this is just out – from net migration into the state over the last 10 years. It accounted for 76% of the state's population growth. So people moving here, moving for jobs, moving for lots of good reasons into the state, that is accounting for a lot of that this time around. And it's been increasing.

So let's go to the next one. Growth regularly has been ticking upwards in eastern Washington. In western Washington it remains strong in most of the counties. It's stronger to the county to the north – they've seen more growth than we have – and to the county to the south. They've seen more growth. What does that mean to us? And it's tied probably to housing availability as well. Housing is starting to change. Burlington – the same company that did the Pump House Drive, Burlington, is called the Stevens Apartments now – is out and it's going to be just across the road, but it's going to be on the west side of the highway. 156 new housing units adjacent to the Cascade Mall, but you'll have to go through the bicycle trail underneath the freeway there to get to it. It'll be right in that area. So that's a pretty significant change. But it's Sage Homes proposing this again. And they're looking for areas to invest in: Ferndale and other places such as Lynden and Burlington, Sedro-Woolley, elsewhere. And there are other companies as well, obviously.

Let's go to the next slide. We should also look further north too, because there's an effort looking at tying the growth in Vancouver and Surrey to – and other, like Burnaby and many others – back down to the Seattle area and all the way to Portland. And the way that they're proposing to do that – and we will be talking about this coming up at the county conference too and also at the American Planning Association or the Planning Association of Washington conference – will be a high speed rail connection between those places. And one of the principle reasons is that you get synergies in these other places. What is going on in Surrey? Well, Surrey is all about the picture right there. You take a university; you co-locate the university on top of 140 shops; you put it in a city center; and then you build medical research above that. So you have the integration of public private university, with other private things, and you put it all in one site. The nickname for that is called Vancouverism, but really it's kind of just a layer cake of investment. And that's what they're doing and it's been highly successful. They are projected to reach a million people and to be the largest – they're projected between now and 20, I think, 50 – sometime – to beat Vancouver for Vancouver's growth. So they are tied to light rail and they're tied to higher ed, and what is also located there is North America's probably premiere quantum computing site. And so why is that important? Well, who's investing in quantum computing? Amazon, Lockheed, our defense industry, everybody. And that's the leader in probably the world right now – well, it's one of them anyway. And so when you tie that together with all the high tech stuff – you know, the 17 buildings that are being built in Redmond – there's just a lot going on, and we are becoming that preeminent place for job creation and technology when you include both of these. And Skagit is right in the middle of that. So what does that mean? How do we preserve what's most beautiful about Skagit County and our agriculture? I think that's the challenge of our next Comp Plan. That's why I bring it us.

So let's go to the next one. So there's lots of information on the technology stuff there. I do plan on sending you about three or four articles, if you want that kind of stuff. The New York Times

had an article out a couple of weeks ago on Seattle. The Geek Wire had something out on why is Seattle doing so good at this time. And there's just a lot of information coming out on the growth of BC right now. BC is not anything where Washington is, but they're growing very quickly because of their investment that they're making and because of the integration of – they clearly understand the integration of university educations with work force, tying it from K through 12 right to college, right into the work force. University of Washington is doing it as well.

So FYI. That's just stuff that's going on. Thank you so much for the time to let me explain that.

Chair Raschko: Thank you –

Mr. Gill: I do have just one slide, if I could, Chair. Not as exciting. I don't have big numbers or nice pictures, but I only have one slide just to go over next meeting, or next few meetings. So we'll keep going with the Shoreline deliberations, but we do have to have that hearing that's scheduled for the 9th, so that'll also be at the next meeting. The 23rd, if we still have Shorelines to work on we will do that. We need to get through a recorded motion on the Capital Facilities Plan as well. December, we'd like to get to the docket, the 2021 docket. We've had one work session. We'd like to start talking about some of the other ones. We have some petitioners that are really interested in making sure that we're making some progress. So anyway, we're ready to go with that stuff. We will send around a calendar to see if we can't squeeze a fourth meeting in before the end of the year, and we'll communicate with you on that issue. I also wanted to note – I don't know if this was mentioned, but Commissioner Henley had to drop out about an hour ago because of power failure at his place. So I just want to make sure that's noted because it's not necessarily obvious in a meeting like this. So that is all I have. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Are there any questions for staff?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you very much. We'll move to Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements, and we'll pick on Commissioner Woodmansee first.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. Well, I guess I just want to say a big thank-you to Betsy and Dan again for indulging all the conversation and listening and helping us with the conversation. And I appreciate the professionalism with which they do their job. It makes it much easier to do the conversations and deliberations as we move forward. And so I just want to let you know I appreciate your guys' hard work. I've said it before: There's no way I could do it. I just couldn't do it. So anyways, thank you very much.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Joe. Commissioner Rose?

Commissioner Rose: Oh, I'd just like to ditto what Joe said, because it does make our job a lot easier to have those clear explanations. So thank you both.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: I concur with the other two. I hope everybody gets to feeling better. And I'm sorry I lost you guys for about the first half-hour. We had the power/Internet loss first and it must have moved across to Anacortes! So anyway, thanks for your indulgences and all your patience, guys.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Commissioner Knutzen.

Commissioner Knutzen: Yeah, I agree with what the previous Commissioners said. I don't comment very much. I'm the new – one of the new guys here. I want you to know that I *am* listening. I *am* paying attention. But it is still quite overwhelming to me, all this stuff. So I do have questions periodically but it seems like someone always asks them – Kathy! – before I have a chance to anyway. One other thing. Director Hart, you mentioned 156-housing unit development west of I-5. Is that single-family housing, multifamily apartments, all of the above? I was just kind of curious.

Mr. Hart: That will be multifamily housing and it's – yeah, completely multifamily housing on the other side.

Commissioner Knutzen: Is there much single-family housing being built in Burlington anywhere?

Mr. Hart: I've found one subdivision, which it seems like it's raised above the floodplain and it is kind of in east Burlington – yeah, a little bit east of the downtown. And I haven't seen any housing there yet, but that's the only one. I have the same question you do. I think there's some – I think also there's been some in the downtown area. Periodically there's been some in the infill in the downtown. So now that I remember that.

Commissioner Knutzen: I've seen some on Fairhaven, but even there I think they're duplex or triplex. But anyway, I was just curious. That was all. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Commissioner Hughes.

Commissioner Hughes: Nothing more to add. Thank you, everyone.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Amy. Commissioner Henley is still gone, I presume. I just wanted to thank Director Hart. I thought that was a very interesting report you gave, so thank you. And I also want to second on everybody's appreciation for the staff and the work they've done. Good explanations – was very good. So if nobody has anything else, we'll say goodnight and be adjourned. Thank you, everybody.