

Skagit County Planning Commission
Deliberations: UGA Open Space Concept Plan
Work Session: 2009 Miscellaneous Code Amendments
July 30, 2009

Commissioners: **Bill Stiles, Chairman**
 Jason Easton, Vice Chairman
 Carol Ehlers
 Annie Lohman
 Mary McGoffin
 Dave Hughes
 Jerry Jewett
 Matthew Mahaffie
 Kristen Ohlson-Kiehn (absent)

Staff: **Gary Christensen, Planning Director**
 Carly Ruacho, Senior Planner
 Kirk Johnson, Senior Planner
 Arne Denny, Civil Deputy Prosecutor

Others: **Tom Beckwith, Consultant**

Chairman Bill Stiles: (gavel) I'd like to welcome everybody to this special meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission. Our agenda is fairly short tonight but we'll see how it goes. First up is Deliberations on the Open Space Concept Plan.

Gary Christensen: Okay. Let me introduce this and Carly can maybe help us walk through the memo which has been provided to you in advance. First of all, everybody should have – I hope – a stapled set of revisions which includes a memorandum from Carly to you, dated July 17th. And I think we sent these out to you last week for your advance review on our discussion tonight. For the most part what is included as part of this packet are those things that we discussed when we last met and you asked that there be some changes and revisions or clarifications and the like made. And we have done that and we hope they meet with your satisfaction. And in Carly's memorandum those are numbered as 1 through 9, and those items, then, are found if you simply flip through the pages. And we can get to those in a moment.

The other thing that we have done to be efficient and to take advantage of the opportunity where we have you all in one room is we have drafted a recorded motion, which we hope accurately represents your deliberations, the recitals, that there's appropriate findings of fact. And there is a motion then, and it certainly is

at your discretion to modify and change or, if it's okay, accept as drafted. But tonight we are here – we hope – with our last meeting on the Open Space Concept Plan. And if you're ready then before the end of this agenda item we would hope that you can make a recommendation and forward this on to the Board for their consideration and action.

So that's how we hope to talk about this. We could proceed however you want to. We could simply ask, Are there any questions about the attachments as identified in Carly's memorandum 1 through 9, or we could go through each of those or, if there's no comment and you just feel like it's okay as presented, we could spend our time on the recorded motion. So I just turn to you as to how you would like to proceed.

Chairman Stiles: Anyone have any questions? Jason.

Jason Easton: Yeah, this is actually a pretty simple question. If I remember – this was a while back when we had this hearing so I have a question – if I remember, this one's unique, right? Because once we send it from here up to the Commissioners, then it goes back to SCOG? Is that right? Because it's got to be approved by the rest of the jurisdictions, too?

Mr. Christensen: Right, right. This is a collaboration. Certainly the municipalities and the County, through a Skagit Council of Governments grant, have worked together on this.

Mr. Easton: Sure.

Chairman Stiles: Carol?

Carol Ehlers: With the addition of one word, I'm perfectly happy to vote now.

Mr. Christensen: Okay.

Ms. Ehlers: I am so pleased at how Carly did it because as far – all the things that I was concerned about have been done. And I have a word to add on page 4 of 6 in the motion.

Mr. Christensen: Okay. I also want to give some credit to Mr. Beckwith here – Tom – who actually has helped us get to where I think you wanted to be. And so he's been instrumental in doing the mapping changes and doing some of the text work, so I want to acknowledge Tom for his assistance and help with this as well. And other staff who have had a helping hand, but I simply can't name them all. But thank you for your comments.

Ms. Ehlers: If somebody wants to – I mean, I can shut up after this. On page 4 of 6, number 6, this has to do with my request for that –

Mr. Christensen: This is the recorded motion, Carol?

Ms. Ehlers: This is the recorded motion.

Mr. Christensen: Toward the back of your packet.

Ms. Ehlers: The back of the last item: “A map depicting Wilderness areas, National Forests,” et cetera, “designated as Open Space of Regional and Statewide Importance.” Thank you for adding it. It’s a section out of the zoning code and the Comprehensive Plan zoning map. So I would like to add the word – you can put it where you want to, but I would say, “A zoning map depicting” these things, which makes it clear to CTED – which raised some questions – it makes it clear to CTED and anywhere else that this isn’t a willful thing that you can change at the drop of a hat or that somebody can come in and say, I don’t like it; I’d like such and such. This is a legal zoning map – and that is its strength in any kind of argument the County may get into with organizations, which are out there; I’m really thinking of the Puget Sound group – as to what lands in Skagit County are publically owned and publically set aside for public use of whatever different kind. I remember that the young woman from Mount Vernon didn’t know where she could take her boys because she didn’t know where the land was public. And that’s a problem I’ve heard from others. So I’d like the word – add the word “zoning” simply to strengthen it.

Chairman Stiles: Any discussion about that?

Annie Lohman: I think you, Carol, you’ve got to be careful that you don’t go beyond the task of what the project is for. It’s for identifying open space and greenbelts between and in UGAs. And if you want it to be the all-encompassing identifier, that’s not what the document is actually for, in my opinion, when I went back and looked at what the task was.

Ms. Ehlers: Well, in that case you have to take all that Open Space of Regional Importance list out of the document, too.

Ms. Lohman: Well, I think it’s just informational.

Ms. Ehlers: That’s why it’s in there.

Ms. Lohman: Right, but you’ve got to be careful that you don’t expand the scope.

Ms. Ehlers: The scope has already been expanded when we have the Farmland Legacy and all the rest of Appendix B.

Mary McGoffin: I think the lady that you mentioned could find places to take her children without digging through a document like this.

Ms. Ehlers: Well, she didn't.

Ms. McGoffin: No, I mean, the parks departments have really user-friendly ways to find out where to go. I tend to agree with Annie on this, that it goes outside the scope of what this thing needs to do.

Ms. Ehlers: Then you have to take the other things which are outside the scope out also. It's part and parcel.

Chairman Stiles: Why don't we have a motion and we'll do it that way? Carol?

Ms. Ehlers: I would like to move to add the word "zone" to this. We agreed to this weeks ago – in April, I think it was – and so I move to add the word "zoning" just to make it clear what this map that's proposed at the beginning of the text means.

Chairman Stiles: Any discussion? Gary, do you have a –

Mr. Christensen: Is there a second? Was there a second?

Mr. Easton: Mr. Chair? You don't have a second.

Chairman Stiles: Is there a second to the motion?

(silence)

Chairman Stiles: There is none. It dies for lack of a second.

Ms. Lohman: Mr. Chair? I thought that we had said something about the colors in the legend. Did you – when I looked on the screen and I was just reading over the printed map, you have a gray color but it's not in the legend. Is that just an oversight? On the very first map.

Tom Beckwith: No, it's UGA. And it's the same color on the legend as it is in the graphic. It's just a very light gray so that's probably why you don't think it's there. Those are the UGA boundaries.

Ms. Ehlers: On the Anacortes map you don't have the UGA in gray.

Mr. Beckwith: It's not on the legend on that?

Ms. Lohman: On the very first map you have – on the legend it shows –

Mr. Christensen: What's the name of the first map?

Mr. Beckwith: What page?

Ms. Lohman: Skagit Countywide Open Space Concept Map.

Chairman Stiles: Excuse me – Carly, do you have another set of them? I thought I had mine.

Ms. Ehlers: Yes, it is on some of them.

Mr. Easton: The version I'm looking at shows just the UGA and Scenic Roads underneath the title.

Mr. Beckwith: It's the very first graph I did: Skagit Countywide Open Space Concept Plan.

Ms. Lohman: And it has a date under it.

Mr. Beckwith: Is this what you're looking at?

Ms. Lohman: Yes. And then on the Scenic Roads one it has a gray-colored area, but in the legend it's a yellow-colored area.

Mr. Beckwith: My copy's black and white so I can't tell. It should be gray.

Mr. Christensen: It's green – I don't know – are they the same?

Ms. Ehlers: It's kind of an odd green.

Mr. Christensen: These are a different tone maybe, Tom.

Mr. Beckwith: They may because the graphic is done separately from the legends so when the legend is backfill for color we have to try to find a gray that's as close as we can match. But that's what the gray stands for is the UGA boundaries.

Ms. Lohman: Well, I think the legend has to have the same color scheme as the map. I think that's, like, basic.

Mr. Christensen: Okay.

Carly Ruacho: I think we can fix that.

Mr. Christensen: We can fix that, yeah.

Ms. Ehlers: Because you're right: It *is* inconsistent.

Ms. Lohman: The legend seems consistent throughout all the pages, but the maps' color schemes –

Ms. Ruacho: Is it mostly the Scenic Road ones, Annie?

Mr. Beckwith: No, all the legends were reproduced the same way. They're all reproduced in Word so we're stuck with the colors that Word can reproduce, versus the graphics are in Photoshop and the color cones are different.

Mr. Easton: You can't create the legend in Photoshop, Tom, and then just paste it into each page?

Ms. Lohman: I think we can.

Mr. Beckwith: The problem – we would have to go from Word to a pdf to Photoshop and back. It would probably crash. That's the only reason why it's different, if it is different.

Ms. Lohman: But it should be the same.

Mr. Christensen: Yep, we can do that.

Ms. Ruacho: Because I think it's mostly those two all-county ones. The other individual maps get a lot closer.

Ms. Lohman: Well, look at the Bayview one. It's off, too. So it's – and the Burlington one – it's throughout.

Ms. Ruacho: Because the first couple city ones are good, and then they start getting greeny. And that could just be our – you know, this is a reproduction of an e-mail, too, you know, so we can look at the original and see what we can do.

Mr. Beckwith: Yeah, it could also be the printer.

Ms. Ruacho: Right.

Mr. Christensen: It could be our color printer that's –

Ms. Ruacho: Well, one was printed and then they were copied on a copier so, you know, there's been quite a bit of production. This isn't the – there'll be only one master plan that's attached to the ordinance. We'll make sure that those – that one's good.

Chairman Stiles: Okay, any other questions or comments? Annie?

Ms. Lohman: In the document, it does suggest that this is identifying open space immediately between and within the UGAs and that it's not – and it's not a definitive description of the open space in Skagit County, with exception to references and various appendixes. I think if you could make that statement bolder – bold, or maybe repeat it throughout – so that the public does not think that this is a recreational plan. Because sometimes they lose sight of what the title of the plan was.

Mr. Beckwith: Where's the first time we talk that way?

Ms. Lohman: I think it's on the very first – I didn't highlight exactly where it was. But you do say that language. I just wrote it on my note, on my generalized comment about the document.

Mr. Beckwith: Yeah, we do say that. I guess our question is to find out where we say it at and maybe we just bold and italicize it.

Ms. Lohman: Oh, you're asking me *where* we should?

Mr. Beckwith: Yeah, where it is, yeah. That's all. We'll just have to find it and do that.

Ms. Lohman: Yeah, but –

Mr. Christensen: Are you wanting us to search through the document and wherever that term is we make it bold?

Ms. Lohman: I just wanted to make sure that nobody misconstrues what this plan is – that it doesn't take on a life beyond what its task was; it doesn't become a recreational plan; it doesn't become a trails plan. It is a plan for identifying open space between and within a UGA, and a couple of other –

Mr. Easton: Do you not feel like the recorded motion that – the draft recorded motion that we have – addresses from a legality point of view that this isn't a trails plan, that this isn't a recreational plan?

Ms. Lohman: I think that the recorded motion –

Mr. Easton: Because, I mean, we could amend that.

Ms. Lohman: -- is easy to separate from the Plan.

TRANSCRIBER'S NOTE: FROM THIS POINT ON, NOISE FROM THE RECORDER MAKES SEVERAL COMMENTS INAUDIBLE.

Chairman Stiles: (inaudible)

Mr. Easton: Well, why don't we have the recorded motion attached to the Plan?

Mr. Christensen: Yeah, and the adopting ordinance, too.

Ms. Ehlers: Yes.

Mr. Easton: We could amend our recorded motion to dictate that the recorded motion and the adopting ordinance are attached to the Plan.

Mr. Beckwith: Oftentimes it's put right behind the cover.

Mr. Easton: I would feel – I'd feel more comfortable with that.

Mr. Beckwith: Sure.

Ms. Ehlers: Particularly since the other jurisdictions that have to agree would need to know what and why.

Matthew Mahaffie: Yep, why don't we do that?

Mr. Easton: I'll make the motion that we amend the draft recorded motion that we haven't voted on yet, but I'll move to amend it to include the draft – excuse me – to include the – to have self-included the actual documents included in the Plan with addition – the addition to the – boy –

Mr. Christensen: -- the adopting ordinance.

Mr. Easton: Yeah, thanks – whatever Gary just said. That was painful!

Chairman Stiles: May I have a second to whatever that was?

Ms. Lohman: Second.

Chairman Stiles: The motion is seconded. Any further discussion? Hearing none, those in favor, say aye.

Ms. Ehlers, Chairman Stiles, Dave Hughes, Mr. Mahaffie, Ms. McGoffin, Ms. Lohman, Jerry Jewett and Mr. Easton: Aye.

Chairman Stiles: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chairman Stiles: Any further comments or questions?

Mr. Jewett: I've got a question about that.

Chairman Stiles: Jerry.

Ms. Ruacho: Can I – Hey, Bill – sorry to interrupt, Jerry – just before we move on from that, do you just want it as one of your recommendations? I think you had three recommendations. Do you want that as number 4? Where do you want it, I guess is my question.

Mr. Easton: Where do we want it in the Plan?

Ms. Ruacho: Where do you want me to add a statement that says, "We –

Mr. Easton: Where do I want it in the recorded motion?

Ms. Ruacho: Right. Where do you want your –

Mr. Easton: Point 4 in the recorded motion that the – that the recorded motion is attached.

Ms. Ruacho: Right.

Mr. Christensen: Like "Recommendation R4"?

Ms. Ruacho: Do you want it to be like "R4"?

Mr. Easton: Yep.

Mr. Christensen: Okay.

Ms. Ruacho: I just want to make sure –

Mr. Easton: That's what makes the most sense to me.

Mr. Christensen: It does, yes.

Mr. Easton: As long as the seconder is agreeable to that.

Ms. Ruacho: And who was that? I missed it.

Ms. Lohman: Me.

Chairman Stiles: Annie.

Ms. Ruacho: Thank you.

Ms. Ehlers: I think the air conditioner's off.

Ms. Ruacho: Okay, sorry, Jerry.

Chairman Stiles: Jerry, go ahead.

Mr. Jewett: _____ trails and/or public access on dikes and levees. If the proposed trails on the maps – if we pass this without any other attachments, can those proposed trails become trails without another public hearing?

Mr. Christensen: It's going to require actually that there be interlocal agreements with each of the affected –

Mr. Jewett: Without a public hearing?

Mr. Beckwith: If it's an interlocal agreement, it would have to have one.

Mr. Christensen: Well, not necessarily. An interlocal agreement wouldn't necessarily have a public hearing.

Ms. Ruacho: But it would still need signatures from the owners.

Mr. Christensen: Yeah, yeah.

Ms. Ruacho: So any affected owners – the dike districts, except for in very limited situations, they don't own the property; they just have an easement. So you would still need the underlying property owner's signature on any agreement also.

Mr. Christensen: To give consent?

Ms. Ruacho: To the County.

Mr. Easton: So a trail, in theory, can go from non-existing to existing without a public hearing?

Ms. Ruacho: If a person – you could put a trail on property you own. You could be the only party and you could –

Mr. Easton: Right. Okay, I understand that, but I'm assuming these trails – it's safe to assume these trails cross more than one –

Ms. Ruacho: So every property owner would have to enter into an agreement with the County to grant them an easement.

Mr. Easton: Because you could, in theory, create trails that don't have anything to do with any local government – between you and your neighbors?

Mr. Beckwith: This is still a concept plan. To move to the point where you designate and open a trail, that's project level. So that would at minimum require an MDNS.

Mr. Jewett: Run that by me again.

Mr. Beckwith: At minimum it would require project level action which would likely be a SEPA checklist or some other such official motion before you could just – you couldn't just willy-nilly go out and create the base of a trail without having a process for that.

Ms. Ruacho: So you might only have a written comment period. SEPA would only provide for written comment, but there should be some sort of a comment.

Mr. Christensen: If you look at page 3 of the recorded motion, number 2, your second finding. Based on an agreement that was mutually arrived at between the drainage districts and the County when we established the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, there was a condition of that MDNS – that threshold determination – two of which read as follows: "Any future trails project proposed on dikes or levees shall require the Planning and Permit Center" – now the Planning and Development Services – "to meet, consult and obtain the approval of any involved dike district and the affected property." So there's got to be consent there. "In addition, complete necessary and adequate environmental review prior to issuing a Mitigated Determination of Significance for each specific project or proposal on dikes or levees." So that would be public notice.

Mr. Easton: Can we amend that?

Mr. Jewett: Can we amend it so –

Mr. Christensen: Well, that's a condition of a previous SEPA threshold.

Mr. Jewett: I just want to add "and public hearing."

Mr. Easton: Under that – under number 1 "with the Planning and Permit Center."

Ms. Ruacho: You'd have to add a – that's direct language. So if you guys want to add a separate recommendation you could do that.

Mr. Christensen: Yeah, if you want to make a recommendation, I think that'd be the place to –

Ms. Ruacho: We can't amend the MDNS right now.

Ms. Ehlers: Well, the trailhead –

Mr. Easton: So you'd do it as a separate finding, is what you mean?

Ms. Ruacho: I would make it a recommendation.

Mr. Christensen: I think a recommendation, so let that become, you know, R-4, and then the one that you just passed to make it – the recorded motion ordinance, make that R-5.

Mr. Jewett: Can I make a motion to that?

Mr. Christensen: To do that – in effect, do that? Okay.

Mr. Jewett: I make a motion that –

Mr. Christensen: -- there be a public hearing –

Mr. Jewett: -- there be a public hearing before any of the proposed trails actually could become trails.

Mr. Easton: Okay, I'll second that.

Chairman Stiles: I have a motion and a second – any discussion?

Mr. Easton: I think Jerry's logic's spot on. I think – given the public's outcry when we met with them at our public hearing – I think we have to. That's just fair.

Mr. Jewett: On dikes.

Mr. Easton: Should we specify the land?

Mr. Hughes: There's more than just dikes.

Mr. Easton: I don't think we should specify. I think, in my opinion – as one _____, I'd say in my opinion, I don't think we need to specify. I think it needs to be in general. I mean, if it's on public land it definitely should be a public hearing before that trail converts.

Mr. Jewett: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: Because you're taking a conceptual trail and – I mean, I'm going to err on the side of inviting the public to comment on a trail going from on a plan to being alive and well, even if it's way out in the boonies.

Mr. Mahaffie: That's a little out of our scope of work here. If the Parks Department wants to put a trail in on Park Department land, you have to have a public hearing?

Ms. McGoffin: But it's germane to this plan.

Ms. Ehlers: Well, actually –

Mr. Easton: I don't know if that's out of scope. I mean, you can disagree with me, but –

Ms. Ehlers: -- you might because you have a trailhead, and that *is* something that you have – that's – which section is that in, Carly?

Ms. Ruacho: Well, it's a use. It's, you know, throughout the zoning code. Its level depends on the zone that it's in.

Ms. Ehlers: Okay.

Ms. Ruacho: Some may require public hearings; some may not.

Ms. Ehlers: Well, that would give –

Mr. Easton: Clarity.

Ms. Ehlers: Considering the fight that occurred out on Fidalgo when they tried – when Public Works pretended there was no process for a trailhead, I would certainly second Jason's concept that you have a hearing.

Chairman Stiles: Okay, now we have – do you want to amend the motion then to include things other than dikes and levees?

Mr. Easton: Jerry's motion didn't originally say that.

Mr. Jewett: The original one didn't say that. It just said ___.

Chairman Stiles: Okay.

Ms. McGoffin: I think you can leave it without specifying it because the controversial ones were bringing people in, but the non-controversial ones were just happening with no comment.

Mr. Easton: Well, then Jerry's motion said "proposed trails converted," so ___.

Mr. Jewett: Yeah.

Chairman Stiles: Okay, any further discussion? Questions or comments? Okay, all those in favor, say aye.

Mr. Easton, Mr. Jewett, Mr. Hughes, Ms. Ehlers, Ms. Lohman, Chairman Stiles and Ms. McGoffin: Aye.

Chairman Stiles: Those opposed?

Mr. Mahaffie: Nay.

Chairman Stiles: And one against. Any further comments?

Mr. Easton: I move to adopt the motion as amended – the Planning Commission's recorded motion as amended.

Mr. Jewett: I'll second that.

Ms. Lohman: Wait – can you repeat that?

Mr. Easton: I move to adopt the recorded motion – the draft recorded motion that we have in front of us – I move to adopt this as our recorded motion with the addition of the amendments that were just made tonight.

Ms. Lohman: I think that – are you asking for a motion so we'll have a discussion?

Mr. Easton: I'm making a motion – yeah, I'm making a motion that we accept this recorded motion with the additional amendments that we just passed.

Mr. Hughes: Jerry seconded it.

Ms. Lohman: Mm-hmm.

Chairman Stiles: Any discussion?

Ms. Lohman: I saw a fragment in here – item number 8 on page 4. It's like an incomplete thought – the very first one.

Ms. Ruacho: What page?

Mr. Easton: Page 4 of 6 on the recorded motion.

Ms. Ehlers: Oh, on the motion.

Ms. Lohman: Because that's what we're discussing now, right?

Mr. Easton: Right.

Ms. Ehlers: Where is this?

Ms. McGoffin: Well, the first sentence is not a whole sentence.

Ms. Ehlers: I'm on page 4, but which number?

Several voices: Number 8.

Mr. Easton: First sentence.

Ms. Lohman: Beginning with the word "current." It's an incomplete thought.

Ms. Ruacho: I think after "future uses" it should say "may result," instead of that "result." "Current emerging uses.... may result in open space."

Ms. Ehlers: It needs a verb. And "may" is the correct word for it.

Mr. Jewett: Instead of "that"?

Ms. Ehlers: Mm-hmm. Or you could say "future uses that may result," so you'd add a word.

Mr. Easton: I'll accept either addition to the motion I made.

Chairman Stiles: Any objection to that correction? Hearing none, we'll change that to "may."

Ms. Ruacho: Okay.

Chairman Stiles: Any other comments? We have a motion and a second on the floor. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, say aye.

Mr. Jewett, Ms. Ehlers, Mr. Hughes, Ms. McGoffin, Mr. Easton, Chairman Stiles, Ms. Lohman and Mr. Mahaffie: Aye.

Chairman Stiles: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chairman Stiles: Hearing none, it passes unanimously.

Mr. Christensen: Who seconded it?

Ms. Ruacho: Jerry.

Chairman Stiles: I also thank Jeroldine for the work that she did.

Mr. Easton: Yeah.

Chairman Stiles: Her name wasn't mentioned earlier.

Mr. Christensen: Yes, thank you.

Chairman Stiles: And, Tom, thank you.

Mr. Beckwith: I work for beer.

(laughter)

Mr. Easton: Gentlemen Gene's in twenty minutes!

Ms. Ruacho: Thanks, Tom.

Mr. Christensen: Okay, congratulations. Thank you.

Mr. Easton: Gary, I'd like – and I don't have one with me and I was going to bring one – could we, the next time we gather – I think it would be very classy of this group to give Jeroldine a thank you card, because she obviously went way above and beyond. So I would hope my fellow Commissioners could join me. So if you could provide one so we could have one, that would be outstanding.

Mr. Christensen: Yep.

Chairman Stiles: Okay, the next item on our agenda is a work session regarding Miscellaneous Code Amendments. We have a memorandum from Carly.

Mr. Christensen: Yeah, and the first thing I want to say is that – before we talk about this – is that this is a work session; this is not deliberations tonight. What we have for you are simply the public correspondence which was submitted in writing as well as the transcript that came from the hearing that you had. And our intention is to provide that to you tonight and talk about the process – you know: Where do we go from here? We are not prepared to really engage with you in any kind of substantive comment about any of the code changes. It would be premature to do so because, simply said, you haven't had a chance to review anything. We have, and what we want to do is just talk to you about what the next steps are and where do we go from here.

So I just wanted that to be clear up front. There seemed to be some confusion that was going around earlier this week that the Planning Commission was going

to be meeting tonight and decisions were going to be made, and there seemed to be some fear and anxiety with that, based on some of the public comments that we received. So we want to put you at ease as well as those interested parties who are anxiously awaiting the outcome on these proposed Miscellaneous Code Amendments. So I just wanted to state that up front.

So, as you can see, we have a table with a stack of comments and transcripts – or a transcript, I should say – that we'd like to give you, and you can take that home with you. We also – do they have the memorandum?

Ms. Ruacho: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Christensen: Okay, so you have a memorandum already that's been provided, along with kind of an index or a table. Do you want to just kind of help walk them through that or do you want me to carry on?

Ms. Ruacho: Whatever you want to do.

Mr. Christensen: Okay, why don't you take it from here and I'll ad lib where we need to. I'll start handing them out, okay, as you –

Ms. McGoffin: Are there any extra of the memorandum?

Ms. Ruacho: There's a few. I don't know how many of you out there want them. I have –

Ms. McGoffin: I would like one.

Ms. Ruacho: I have two more. And if anybody else would like one, I can – just give me your name and e-mail and I can e-mail it to you.

Let's back up and talk about the comments first that Gary's bringing around. So what you're going to see on the very first page is a table of contents of sorts. It's going to have your commenter name, the entity that they are associated with, if any, and their date of correspondence. And we did that because you're going to notice that several either individuals or groups commented more than once, so we can't just talk about, you know, the AAB letter or this letter because there's multiple.

But what we have is the page number listed that that letter begins on of that date. And so we have gone through and page-numbered a stack about this size, which is your first clipped-together unit. Those are the actual letters. The rest of what you're getting there are attachments to three of the letters. So you'll see in your table of contents that the second item down, Dave Chamberlain/Forest Advisory Board, says, "See Attachment 1."

Mr. Easton: Wow.

Ms. Ruacho: Attachment 1 has a cover. It's a unit of several items. That's his attachment. Several more down, about the middle on page 15, you'll see "See Attachment 2." That's Attachment 2 that was provided, and then the last item, Bradford Doll, Tupper/Mack/Brower, Attachment 3, and it's its own separate unit.

So your letters are less, you know, offending than you would think – like Jerry didn't want to take this on his vacation in August – but this is, you know, the actual comment letters. So they're pretty easy to get through. They're all page-numbered for ease of use during your deliberations. And then the other items are the attachments.

I do want to point out on the last – or not the last attachment, the *first* attachment, I believe – no, let me – I'm misspeaking. I believe we stuck it in here attached to the second Forest Advisory Board letter, so it's either 42 or 44. I think it starts on page 44 – yeah, it's page 44 and 45. You'll notice that there's kind of a comment of one sentence – or two-sentence comment at the top of the page, and then what you have is basically an index of – one is a Forest Practices HCP, which is a document, and then Forest Practices Rule Book, which are a set of WACs. Because he indexed them like that and he indicated to us when he submitted them that he indicated they were for the record and that handing them out to you was not something that he necessarily intended because he indexed them here, you don't have those documents. They are available at the Planning Department in full – they're also available online – but I just want you to be aware those are not in your packet. Those were yet again another volume and he was comfortable with not giving them because they're indexed on his letters. So I just wanted to point that out. If anyone wants to see them, feel free to come down to the Department and we have them in the record.

Okay –

Ms. Ehlers: Carly?

Ms. Ruacho: Yep, go ahead.

Ms. Ehlers: In each one of these WACs, after the title it has the effective – that's the latest version, I trust? Like 12.22.08.

Ms. Ruacho: Well, I mean, I couldn't be sure without looking whether that's the most recent date or if that's the one that he wants, you know, to submit. But we have a copy of exactly what he submitted, if anyone is interested in the actual hard copy version, if there's any confusion as to which one. And we certainly can provide that to any Commission member if you don't want to come by and review it. If you'd like a copy we can certainly make a copy. So just let me know.

But, at his request, it was just placed in the record rather than transmitted to all of you. That was *his* request.

Mr. Easton: And did you say there was a transcript attached to this?

Ms. Ruacho: No, that's a separate document.

Mr. Easton: Okay.

Ms. Ruacho: So this is to cover the folks who commented at the public hearing who are not captured in your written comments.

Mr. Easton: That's what I was thinking. Thank you.

Mr. Hughes: I don't know if my saddle bags are big enough!

Ms. Ruacho: You'll have to make two trips, Dave!

Okay, so as Gary passes that out, we can maybe move to the memo? The transcripts are pretty self-explanatory. They're just an actual word-for-word. Also available online, as Jason – we were talking about prior to the meeting, if you're interested in searching them, you know, by person or a few words – have you?

Mr. Easton: So far I haven't. I need to do a little better job of investigating how to find those, but Debbie told me they were there. I haven't had a chance to use them.

Ms. Ruacho: You just go right to where your schedule is and right underneath that is where your past meeting information starts showing up.

So now we're on to the memorandum, just dated today, and what this memorandum is is basically like Gary spoke about earlier – that we have had an opportunity that you haven't, which is we have had these comment letters for the last little over a week – a week and two days.

And I will just say in case anybody gets confused if you start reading through these, you were provided at the public hearing comments that had been received during the public comment period that ended the Friday before. After the public comment period – or after the public hearing – you were mailed any items that were turned in at the public hearing. So those are all in here again, so those are kind of repeats. With the extended comment period, we felt that it was a little bit risky that folks might not get them all kind of bunched together, and so we thought that one unit, page-numbered – kind of tabulated – would be what you needed.

So some of these are copies; some are redundant; some you already have in your possession. But you don't have all of them. The ones that came in during that extended comment period after the public hearing are the ones that are new. So the date of correspondence there is – it's not totally in order, but it virtually is. The ones at the bottom are the ones received last. So you could take a look at the back ones, if you've already read through the other ones. If you're reading through going, Boy, this sounds familiar. I thought I already saw this – you *did* already see it.

So what we did, we kind of brain-stormed after we took a look at all the public comments that had been received and came up with what we feel like is a manageable strategy for your deliberations, because this is a very large docket of changes. It's complex and it's very – you know, greatly across topics. Comments varied greatly, both one side and the other, on each topic commented on sometimes.

So in our brain-storming what we came up with as a proposal to you – and that's what's outlined in this memo – kind of you're going to, you know, kind of think about it, tell us – give us your initial feedback right now, because it's going to dictate how we prepare, but then let us know, basically, on the 1st if you're really agreeable – would be to bifurcate the code amendments to what you have on your attached list, which you're all familiar with this table so it's the same table – we'd just use the same format so for your ease of use. What we did was we highlighted some items in red and what we would recommend is that you focus your deliberations for September 1 on the black items.

And if that is something that's agreeable to you guys, that's how we would prepare, is we would be prepared on September 1 to have a response to comments, to be ready to thoroughly discuss justification questions, et cetera, on all the items in black. The items in red we feel they might need more deliberation, more – possibly – more work, more discussion, more preparation on our part for response to comments than we might be able to do by then.

So what we're hoping to do is not bog down the entire process because, as you can see with the items in black, it is a very, very large chunk of these amendments that we feel are virtually non-controversial, easy to move forward with not too much deliberation. You know, you could have a few that, you know, you might disagree with maybe that you pull off that list and want to spend more time on. You know, certainly this is not the be-all and end-all of the – you know – the red and black list. This is just our proposal of what we felt – You know, that one, we think that one deserves some more time, we could use more time to prepare, to talk with other groups – they're some interest groups – we could maybe have some more time to talk with them – those types of things.

So our recommendation is to move forward on the 1st with the items in black to see if we can get some of these adopted sooner rather than later, and then work

on the other ones after these are adopted. So we would move forward the whole process. We would completely separate the process: Move forward with the recorded motion; adoption through the Board; and then begin to work on the red items.

So that's kind of a summarization of the memo on the top, and then you've got the list there. So we're just trying to, you know, think of a way that's more efficient to digest this and move through deliberations, and that's what we've proposed.

Mr. Christensen: It is, to some extent, kind of trying to separate the wheat from the chaff. And we know that based on our review of the comments, recognizing that you have not yet reviewed certainly the entirety of them – you may have reviewed some which you've already been provided – but there are some proposed code amendments for which advisory boards have just said, You know, we need more information on this; we need more explanation. And we will likely engage them and have further discussions and meetings with them to try to clarify it.

So it very well could be that some of those things that they've identified now, which in meetings we've already had they've said, We're going to give you a gross list; you know, if we don't understand it we're going to identify it. And then we hope that we can whittle the gross down to a more minor list. And so we will between now and when we meet with you next have some ongoing dialogue and discussion, and we may resolve some of those and we may not. But what we wanted to do – and, certainly, most, I think, parties who have shown interest in this are supportive of the County and your deliberations to simply move on those that are non-controversial and then let's spend time on those that need further discussion. And so, as Carly indicated, there's really kind of a two-step process here.

And we're trying to just keep this manageable – not hold up everything, but simply on those things that we can agree on, let's dispose of those early, and then we'll spend the rest of our effort trying to work through those that are a bit more difficult, have more controversy, differing opinions. And, you know, we want to *thoroughly* discuss and deliberate on those. So those, which we've identified as red here – and you may have some yourself – we're just not even prepared to discuss those on the 1st, when we reconvene with you. So that's kind of our plan, our thoughts and our recommendation to you.

Chairman Stiles: Jason?

Mr. Easton: So what do you think about our workload over the fall? Are you seeing what's left in red – assuming we approve this – as being our workload for the fall? I mean, are you seeing these coming in – I'm trying to get a gauge of – you know, I mean, granted, I definitely felt like we were drinking out of a major

fire hose when we threw all these on the table, going in lots of directions. So I respect the Department's desire to sort of get some of these done and also look at helping the FAB with others.

Mr. Christensen: We do have – you know, we do want to get before you three individual property owner requests for Comp Plan map amendments, which are part of the docket. And the Board has now prioritized that, based on a work session that we had. So there are three property owner requests and then, based on a settlement agreement with another party, which I'll refer to as Sanfi Acres, we want to try to resolve that before the end of the year as well. So that will be business you have this fall.

Mr. Easton: In addition to possibly working on some of these red items?

Mr. Christensen: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: Okay – just trying to get the lay of the land. Thank you.

Ms. Ehlers: According to the Commissioners' agenda – the Commissioners' minutes – you also talked about Guemes. They've been wondering whether – what the timeline is for them.

Mr. Christensen: Yeah.

Ms. Ehlers: Is that, then, winter time?

Mr. Christensen: Yeah. To be honest, frank and open, you know, we did – the Department went back before the Commissioners and tried to have them re-prioritize our work program, focusing on a few rather than a lot, and trying to best utilize what resources we have – staff, time and money. And so Guemes Island was kind of second on the list. And if – I will say that getting that before you this year is almost improbable. What we hope to be able to do, if time would permit – and it's going to be very difficult to commit any time – would be to try to start having some meetings with GIPAC about their proposal and look at some revisions. But in all likelihood that is probably going to be next year.

Ms. Ehlers: Okay. Ryan Walters came to the Fidalgo Council the other day and said that there were several things – as part of a general discussion on planning processes – and said that there were several things – cautions – that the Department had regarding the Guemes plan that someone had already identified and transportation was one of them. If there is something concrete like that that is almost a Public Works issue, rather than a Planning issue, it would be politically sensible to – no, keep them occupied – to give them something like transportation because there's already a large number of items on the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program – and not waste – not lose their time.

Mr. Christensen: Yes. I certainly understand your comment and I agree with that and support that. In fact, probably a month or so ago I did meet with representatives of GIPAC – the Guemes Island Planning Advisory Committee – and Commissioner Wesen, representation from the Health Department and Public Works. And we talked about, you know, how can we keep the process going. And they made a similar request, which is, If you know something now, can you just tell us what that is and we'd be happy to go work on that some more, but if we don't know what that is, we can't do anymore.

So, you know, we're just – we're going to do the best we can to try to work with them so that – you know, they've put a lot of time and effort into it, they have a lot of enthusiasm. I don't want to see that wane or go away, so if there's something we *can* do we'll certainly try to assist as best we can.

Ms. Ehlers: Well, the South Shore Road, which leads to a very large concentration of very high tax housing, is washing into the sea and that is on the Six-Year TIP.

Mr. Christensen: Yeah.

Ms. Ehlers: So if you could suggest to Ann Marie Gutwein that Public Works work on that aspect of things. It will be a major aspect of that Plan and it's not *your* responsibility; it's not something *you* have to do, but it *is* a movement forward.

Mr. Christensen: Yeah. I can – while I don't want to tonight before you speak on behalf of Public Works or Health Department, but I will say what I heard in the meeting in which we met with GIPAC. They are feeling some of the same – they are feeling some of the same pain that Planning and Development Services is with regard to reduction in staff and, you know, they've all had to re-prioritize and kind of pick what it is that they can do. But everybody is in agreement: You know, let's do what we can. So I think that's well understood.

But those other departments – Public Works is, you know, has an interim Public Works Director and they are just dealing with some shortages in staff, in addition to reduction in forces, so they're not even up to full speed to even be able to provide some assistance.

But we hope that we're moving in the right direction and that we can get to that sooner rather than later.

Chairman Stiles: Carly, I have a question. On the items in red are based mainly on public comments, some type of –

Ms. Ruacho: Some are public comments, some are internal.

Chairman Stiles: I guess my question is, Are there items not in red that were brought up by public comments or testimony?

Ms. Ruacho: There are two. So most of the black received absolutely no public comment, but then I'll follow that up with not all the red received public comment either. Some of that is coming from – because these code amendments is such a long process – we developed them many, many months ago – many of them about a year ago, and in that time sometimes things come up – case law, things like that – where maybe now our legal staff might want some words changed here or there to keep up with –

Chairman Stiles: Basically my question is this: Public comments and stuff that you received, not all of those are in red. And –

Ms. Ruacho: There's two –

Chairman Stiles: -- and I was asking if you had a way to identify those.

Ms. Ruacho: Sure. There's two in black that there were comments received on that we still considered black to go forward on September 11th – or, sorry, September 1st. And that is item – on your table – item number 25, the definition for “utilities,” and then item number 86, page 4.

Mr. Easton: So as a follow-up to that, would you be able to – maybe not tonight, but later – could you communicate to us by e-mail what comments – point us towards who commented on those two, just for our review since –

Ms. Ruacho: Oh, yeah. Well, and we're prepared tonight to talk about it. The commenter is the last commenter listed on your table of contents, which is the Bradford Doll/Tupper, Mack and Brower.

Mr. Easton: Oh, okay. Perfect.

Ms. Ruacho: And he's the last in your packet, the last letter with the Attachment 3. And the reason that that one is a little bit different than the rest of them is because that there's a moratorium currently in effect with relation to those specific amendments. Our proposal on those code amendments is to permanently codify the intent of our moratorium that's currently in effect. And we only have six months when we enact a moratorium in order to take action on permanent code, unless we, you know, re-up the moratorium, which is the complete prohibition. So this enacts the permanent code and then lifts the moratorium, and the moratorium expires on September 15th. So those are on –

Mr. Easton: So this is time-sensitive in that sense.

Ms. Ruacho: -- a time-sensitive issue and that's why those were moved into the black.

Mr. Easton: Okay. When you say you're – I don't know how we want to handle the work session with only one-eighth of tonight's collection of greatness – but when you say you're prepared, what does that mean?

Ms. Ruacho: Well, I mean if you want more information, because those two items are unique. The rest of the black received absolutely no public comment, so the only deliberation or issues that would come up would come from you all. But those two are unique in that there *are* public comments and we have legal counsel here tonight who's been very involved with that issue with the moratorium and is very familiar with the comments, if there needs to be any further discussion tonight whether that, you know, stays on the black list or why it needs to be there or what he thought of the public comments – you know, that type of thing. So Arne Denny is here tonight specifically to talk to that if you need more information.

Ms. Ehlers: How can we talk to it when we haven't read any of it?

Mr. Easton: Well, yeah, because this wasn't part of the public testimony.

Ms. Ruacho: Right, they did not testify at the public hearing. They merely submitted comments on the last day of the comment period.

Mr. Easton: This is garbage. (pause) I just thought that would fit that there.

(laughter)

Mr. Christensen: Solid waste.

Ms. Ruacho: "Solid waste," is the politically correct term!

Mr. Christensen: Without getting into all the merits and the reasons why, as Carly indicated earlier, the County's adopted an interim ordinance; there's a moratorium on where these kinds of facilities can be located in the county. The County's preference is to take action on this by adopting permanent regulations rather than extending the interim ordinance for another six months. So what we will be prepared to do is when you reconvene on September 1st, which is your first night of deliberations, we will have a memorandum addressing the issues and why we're asking you to take action on that.

Mr. Easton: Which would be given to us – historically – before we came.

Mr. Christensen: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Because what I'd like – and it's just one Commissioner's opinion, Mr. Chair – instead of hearing from the attorney on a topic that all we know about is just what's on the cover sheet basically, or if it's faster you can read the letter from these folks – Bradford Doll – I would like it attached to your memo which is from Arne – you know, what the legal counter is to it, because obviously one of his opening lines is he thinks it's violating the Growth Management Act. And obviously we like to stay away from those kinds of positions, so some insight from the other attorney's point of view would be helpful.

Chairman Stiles: Do you have the ordinance number for the moratorium?

Mr. Christensen: I don't. Arne, do you have the interim ordinance number off the top of your head?

Arne Denny: It's 20090002.

Chairman Stiles: Okay.

Mr. Christensen: And that's available online if you want to take a look at that.

Mr. Easton: So my suggestion, Mr. Chair, is to accept the staff's recommendation for how we split the deliberations with a note asking that in our packet we receive a letter from legal counsel – from the County's legal counsel – in response to that specific letter as it relates to that issue. Given that – to the rest of my Commissioners – given that those are the two that apply in that – you know – would apply in that manner. That makes the most sense to me.

Chairman Stiles: Do we have a second?

Ms. McGoffin: I second that.

Chairman Stiles: Mary seconded. Any discussion? Hearing none, those in favor, say aye.

Mr. Easton, Mr. Jewett, Mr. Mahaffie, Mr. Hughes, Chairman Stiles, Ms. Ehlers, Ms. McGoffin and Ms. Lohman: Aye.

Chairman Stiles: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chairman Stiles: It's unanimous. We'll next be deliberating on this on the 1st.

Ms. Ehlers: If we have questions about specific things, Carly, there's – it would be useful to be able to address them to you personally instead of taking up Planning Commission time.

Ms. Ruacho: Sure. If you feel that, you know, you just have a question, want to better understand what – you know – what we mean, why we did it – anything like that – I mean, feel free to give me a call in between then so that you can prepare for deliberations. You don't want to come not understanding to your deliberations. So if there's something that you need to talk about, definitely feel free to give me a call.

Ms. Ehlers: One of the things I'd like to know is how the Department defines "manning a utility." Some years ago when current people weren't around the Department decided that a bookkeeper was manning a water system. I would hope that that kind of decision would be more precise these days.

Chairman Stiles: Okay, let's continue on with our agenda. We have a discussion on our bylaws.

Mr. Christensen: Yes, and I am handing those out to you. And let me just first say that the color choice was not mine. These come to you from Ryan. I have not read them. And so these came to me from Ryan about 5:05 and he said, Please print these and hand them to the Planning Commission. Apologize for my not being able to attend.

And what these reflect is, I believe, your work and effort in your suggested changes to your bylaws, and also then it is legal counsel's review of your proposed changes and comments.

Ms. Ehlers: Is it possible to get a copy of this in a better print size?

Mr. Easton: The font came out really small.

Ms. Ruacho: Well, that's because of the comments.

Mr. Christensen: It does that because of the comments on the side.

Ms. Ruacho: We can put the comments down below.

Mr. Christensen: We can put the comments at the end, I think.

Ms. Ruacho: But it's very hard to find where they go when you do that.

Ms. Ehlers: Well, that's odd because you've done things before when the comments were added and it was in normal font size.

Ms. Lohman: Not with Word.

Ms. Ruacho: Well, not in a balloon format. I am not a fan of balloons so I don't work that way, but –

(laughter)

Mr. Easton: I don't like balloons, I don't like clowns, but don't let _____.

Ms. Ruacho: Yeah! So when people do comments like this, it's a formatting thing. If they insert their comment in a balloon, then this is what Word does, is it shrinks down the page. We could put them at the bottom and then they would just be here in rows at the bottom in different colors, but they're often very hard –

Mr. Christensen: You don't know – it's harder to track where the – what the comment is referring to.

Ms. Ruacho: We could give you another one with no bullets.

Ms. Ehlers: Someone needs to talk to TetraTech, because on the flood committee that Jason's on they get nice print with nice balloons and it's easy to read.

Mr. Easton: Yeah, they were out of money.

Ms. Ruacho: Well, I was going to say they got the big bucks down there.

Mr. Easton: Yeah, we ran out of money. They're no longer consulting with us.

Ms. Ruacho: Yeah, they don't give you the nice paper anymore!

Chairman Stiles: What the suggestion on these is to take them and review them for our next meeting?

Mr. Christensen: Yes, exactly. You know, I couldn't respond to anything that Ryan has prepared because I haven't read it but, yeah, the idea is you're just getting them tonight; take them home; look at them; when we next meet, we can talk about them.

Mr. Easton: Put them on the schedule. Do you guys know – since you may not know the answer to this – whose comments – are these Ryan's comments?

Mr. Christensen: These are Ryan's comments.

Mr. Easton: All the comments are Ryan's comments?

Ms. Lohman: No, I believe – *our* additions after our last swipe at it are in blue.

Mr. Easton: Okay.

Ms. Lohman: The red text with the strikeouts is what we deleted. Ryan's comments or deletions or whatever are highlighted.

Ms. Ruacho: In pink.

Ms. Lohman: In the pink.

Mr. Easton: So if he took something out, he put it in, it's the pink –

Ms. Ruacho: It's highlighted in the pink fuzz.

Mr. Easton: Then the comments on what he did in pink would be Ryan's comments and the yellow comments would be our comments about what we had done on that?

Ms. Ruacho: Annie's.

Mr. Easton: Or Annie's?

Ms. Lohman: Well, I – if I had known they were going to show up, I would have pinked mine off, but I see he did the same thing so we're both ____.

Ms. Ruacho: Annie is –

Mr. Easton: So at "Section 1 – General," that would be your comment, Annie, that says "Redundant"?

Ms. Lohman: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Not that I disagree. I actually _____ today.

Ms. Ruacho: Yeah, those are Annie's that say "H." She is – what are you, Hewlett-Packard user or something like that?

Ms. Lohman: Yes.

Ms. Ruacho: She doesn't have her name set up so she comes up anonymous!

Mr. Easton: And "RW" is Ryan. Okay, that clarifies that. Thank you.

Ms. Lohman: On my computer it says my name, but I don't know why his computer –

Ms. Ruacho: Yeah, for some reason when you come to the County you become this anonymous computer!

Chairman Stiles: Okay, moving on then, the next item on our agenda is any General Issues – if any. Does anybody have anything? Gary, do you guys have anything?

Mr. Christensen: I don't, other than it being just extremely hot this week.

Chairman Stiles: I'll bring up the question of the dress code because I made a – I made a, you know, concerted effort to actually wear pants and I've been half-naked the last few days.

(laughter)

Chairman Stiles: So it's okay to wear shorts to the meeting, but probably not a public hearing. But our work sessions it's okay.

Mr. Christensen: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Ehlers: Are we going to be here on the 1st of September?

Mr. Christensen: 1st of Sept we should be in the new building – remodeled – the new Commissioners' hearing room. So we will – the Department will not be moving in, I think, until later in September, but the Commissioners' move is supposed to happen in early August.

Ms. Ehlers: Will you have a tutoring session for those of us – not Jason – on how to deal with the bells and whistles?

Mr. Christensen: Yes, we'll probably set up a – I mean, maybe what we do is – we'll think about this. Maybe when we meet on the 1st we just come in for an hour early and Rich Monroe just kind of walks you through how the facility works and all the media effects and – I mean, I'm going to have to go through that myself, as well.

Ms. Ehlers: Well, judging from what I've seen with the really nice equipment that's in the Commissioners' room now, which most people who work for the County don't know how to use, and many people don't know how to use it at all effectively. If there were something that Rich could put in writing on how to use the most obvious, basic stuff, because more than once somebody who came for public comment or presented to the Commissioners, if they could actually put a map or a drawing on that equipment so that everyone in the room and on the television could see it, there would be a much faster, more effective presentation.

Mr. Christensen: Yeah. And this will be a different set-up. I mean, no longer will three of you be sitting up front with the projector projecting right through you onto a screen. So it'll be a different set-up and, you know, we, I think, are fortunate and should be – I'm anxious to get in there.

Mr. Easton: And, in general, workload-wise, Gary, just one general question: Are you seeing us, you know, in the fall twice a month as kind of how you're seeing the future?

Mr. Christensen: Yeah, I think so.

Mr. Easton: So up till around our Christmas break?

Mr. Christensen: Yep, and then we'll have our Christmas break and, you know, as to what's going to happen in the first of the year, it's just –

Mr. Easton: We don't know what our work order is then – work plans – are then. I don't mind that; I'm just trying to make sure I have a sense of scheduling.

Mr. Christensen: Yeah, this fall, I think, probably try to plan on, you know, twice a month meetings, every other week. And, you know, we'll do what we can to prepare you as best as you can be prepared in advance of those meetings so we can make the best use of our time when we're together.

Mr. Easton: Okay. Great.

Chairman Stiles: Okay, anything else? Annie?

Ms. Lohman: Does the mailing that we got between meetings about the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Plan – do we – is that customary to get separate – that where we don't, as a body, meet?

Ms. Ehlers: Yes, we've done that for – we used to meet a long, long time ago and then most of the Planning Commission didn't see the need for it, and so she sends it out –

Mr. Easton: You're talking about on the TIP?

Ms. Ehlers: On the TIP.

Ms. Lohman: That's only on this?

Mr. Easton: That's the TIP, right.

Ms. Lohman: That's only on this ____? I didn't know _____.

Ms. Ehlers: And that's – by reading that is how I learned all the transportation stuff that applies to Guemes which fits in, you see, with the plan. Because they're actually going – Public Works is actually going to do a lot of these things in the next year or two.

Mr. Easton: It's very out of the ordinary. It's the only thing I can remember that we get that we don't actually do anything in our meetings with that I know of, right?

Ms. Ehlers: But Ann Marie is very good about adding whatever you want to add. No, she really is.

Chairman Stiles: Okay, anything else?

Mr. Jewett: Just because it's on there doesn't mean it's going to happen right away.

Mr. Easton: Yeah – you need the money.

Ms. Ehlers: Oh, yes – Annie? One of the things that Ann Marie has taught us is that the engineering part in the County – the part that has to plan and get money and grant money and the rest of it – anything that they want money for has to be on the Six-Year TIP. And so some things are on in if they're going to start to think about what they might do with a problem, like the South Shore Road where they really have no idea what they're going to do. It has to be on the Six-Year TIP to justify public and state money to do the thinking about it. And so that's why Jerry says sometimes it comes on and then it disappears. And some things that are on that because they thought it was engineering are taken off because they found that maintenance – the road fund – could do it with a lot less paperwork.

Chairman Stiles: Okay –

Ms. Ehlers: So that's how it actually works.

Chairman Stiles: Anything else? This meeting (gavel) is adjourned.