

**Skagit County Planning Commission
Deliberations: 2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendments
November 12, 2013**

Commissioners: Annie Lohman, Chair
Josh Axthelm, Vice Chair
Jason Easton
Dave Hughes
Elinor Nakis
Keith Greenwood
Kevin Meenaghan
Robert Temples
Matt Mahaffie

Staff: Dale Pernula, Planning Director
Gary Christensen, Planning Manager
Kirk Johnson, Senior Planner
Brian Adams, Parks & Recreation Director

Public Commenters: Randy Good
Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County
Carol Ehlers
Ed Stauffer

Others: John Semrau, Parks Advisory Board
Patrik Dylan, Parks Consultant
Roger Howard, Burlington-Edison School Board President
Patsy Martin, Port of Skagit Executive Director
Jon Sitkin, Attorney for Property Owner John Bouslog

Chair Annie Lohman: Okay, welcome (gavel). This is a special meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission. It is Tuesday, November 12, 2013, and it's 6 p.m. It looks like everybody is here, and if you could review the agenda for any additions and corrections. Okay, seeing none we'll move right in to Public Remarks. Is there anybody from the public? Come right up. Be sure to state your name and your address and remember it's three minutes, and Mr. Easton is going to be our timer tonight.

Randy Good: Randy Good, 35482 State Route 20, Sedro-Woolley. I want just a few comments on the Capital Facilities Plan, which was passed here. Mr.

Walters has been telling the Planning Commission that the Cascade Trail pavement project was in the Capital Facilities Plan, and I guess that's what allowed them to do that paving project. But I wanted to – on the Capital Facilities Plan that just went through your process here, on page 6 it says – quote – “The Capital Facilities Plan is a planning document, not a budget for expenditures nor a guarantee that the project will be implemented” – end quote.

Once again, Walters, in my opinion, is purposely misleading the Planning Commission and the County Commissioners and the public to justify paving the – doing that project on the path of corruption. The Capital Facilities Plan has no process for public comment, no process for environmental review, or no process for a project to go through there period. It is only a budgeting tool. So I encourage the Planning Commission to check on that before, just to make sure everybody's on the right page. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Okay, next?

Ellen Bynum: Good evening, Commissioners. Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County, 110 North First Street, Mount Vernon. I'd like to bring to the Commissioners a document that has been presented before, which is a compilation of the number of acres of farmland that have been converted to other uses. This was done in 2008, and the reason I'm bringing it to you today is because we had written a letter to former Governor Gregoire concerning getting a policy for agencies to use before they were able to take – to purchase land and take the farmland use off of the land. In Skagit County we had 3,000 acres in 2008 and I have not done the count for the subsequent years, but the Ag Advisory group has decided that that's something that they want to know about so possibly they're going to do that. And some of these conversions are – when we say “conversion” I mean the use is no longer for growing food. In light of the Governor's focus on food security and his emphasis on creating a production center in the northwest corner, I think it would be of interest to the Planning Commission to possibly begin to talk about standards or rules that you might want to put in place that have an overlay of food security. It's not a – I'm not asking for a zoning change, I'm not asking for anything else, but just a criteria that you might use so that when things come before you that actually take land out of agricultural use you have some criteria for judging whether that should happen or not.

So I bring this again to you and included with it is the previous letter to Gregoire, which was – remains unanswered, and a new letter to Governor Inslee asking him to evaluate his food security policy and this agency's activities in Skagit County. I mean, if he wants to apply that to the northwest corner, that would be fine. I know the Planning Commission doesn't usually be – are not really out there doing proactive things, but you certainly are making decisions that indirectly affect food production so I would appreciate your attention to this. Thanks. I also

have the documents that back up the research that has the summary if you want to look at those. Thanks.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. Next.

Carol Ehlers: Carol Ehlers, Wind Crest Lane, West Fidalgo Island. I'm going to follow through on something that Ryan talked to you about at least one meeting ago and that's the legal record.

For any kind of legal announcement in this county the *Skagit Valley Herald* classifieds is the place to find it for almost everyone except the City of Anacortes. There are seventy taxing districts just in Skagit County. You'd go nuts trying to keep track of each one of their websites every day to see if they had a legal notice. State and federal government agencies – all of them – tribal agencies, everybody who is going to do anything legally in this county and requires that the public – where the law requires the public know of it, you find it in the classifieds. I have found the classifieds to be the single best information source over the years for all kinds of things. You want to know whether the PUD invests in repairing pipelines, you'll find it there. You want to know whether Burlington has a paving project – I think that was what was in tonight. You want to know anything of the strangest sorts of things and you get a picture of it in the *Herald* in the classifieds. What's on the Internet is in addition to that. If you want to know about foreclosures you read some of them there but you read more of them in the *Anacortes American*. There were times in the last couple of years when there would be ten to fifteen new foreclosures each week. That's an eye-opener for the county's economy and for you as Planning Commissioners to see how things are actually working. And I thought you should all know it and that the public listening to this should know it, because until someone tells you you don't learn of this in school.

Chair Lohman: Okay, anybody else for Public Remarks?

Ed Stauffer: Good evening. Ed Stauffer, Box 114, Bow. Just a reminder that in the '90s we created the mother of all plans for Skagit County. It was called the Growth Management Act. That was called the Bottoms Up Program. The title for that back in those days – the grant that came to us – was Visions For the Future. That to this day is the law of the land. It's been modified on schedule in 2006. In rural Skagit County that includes some 20,000 Rural Residential homeowners. You're responsible for their needs getting met by due process. We're responsible for bringing up things that hurt us. That's also the farming community. 2% of the population with 90,000 acres of property under control and going broke is our farming community. I'd venture to say that our forestry community's the same. Maybe even the fishing industry's the same. Those are the people that are impacted by all these proposals that you consider, so I ask that you make sure that you answer for yourself the question on every proposal that comes before you that impacts the Rural Element of the Skagit County

Comprehensive Plan: Who wrote this? Whose idea was it? Did it come from anybody in Skagit County expressing a Skagit County need? Who paid for it? Where did the money come from? Did you have enough time? And did you understand to get in on the early parts of these proposals, or do you wait until time is spent by staff writing something and then bringing it before you at the last minute to approve? You must test these ideas if they're ideological, outside ideas against the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan, in particular the Rural Element. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Okay, anybody else for Public Remarks?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Okay, seeing none we'll move to agenda item number 3, which is our deliberations, but before we start our deliberations I would like to ask the wishes of the Planning Commission: If the clock tells us it's nine o'clock – what are your wishes? – and we haven't reached a conclusion, do you want to adjourn and reconvene and continue deliberations, or what? What do you want to do?

Jason Easton: I guess my sense would be that if it's – if we're at nine and it's – you know, we're close to a vote – we're not held to the minute of the – you know, the minute to the clock, but if it's clear that we're not close and we're not about to finish then I think we should extend our deliberations till the 19th, as has already been publicly noticed. I believe we have a public notice that's already – at least the website says we have a tentative meeting scheduled for the 19th, so we have that date somewhat set aside.

Dale Pernula: We did at one time. I don't know if it's that clear right now.

Mr. Easton: I know the website just says there's a tentative meeting scheduled for the 19th.

Dave Hughes: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: But that would be my suggestion. If we're not close then we should do the tentative.

Chair Lohman: Okay, I just wanted to have a plan so that we –

Elinor Nakis: I like it!

Chair Lohman: Okay. So moving into deliberations on the 2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendments. There were four amendments: C-1, C-2, C-3 and C-4. Dale?

Mr. Pernula: Okay. Before you –

Mr. Hughes: I'd like to just make an announcement that I did watch all two hours and forty minutes of your meeting last Tuesday and read all the written comments, so I feel that I'm capable of sitting here and deliberating tonight.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. Dale?

Mr. Pernula: Okay, as soon as we were able to we put together three additional documents that you have before you right now. The first one is a supplemental staff report dealing with three of the – the first three of those amendments, C-1, C-2 and C-3. That's the amendment to the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan to incorporate by reference the 2012 County – Skagit County Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan.

C-2 is redesignation of approximately .3 acres of land owned by Del Mar Community Service, and that's the two water tanks.

And C-3 (is) the designation and zoning of 1.5 acres in size to Rural Business, which is just north of the Town of La Conner.

You also have a supplemental staff report dealing with item C-4, which is an amendment to the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan 2013 Update, and you also have a draft recorded motion for the Skagit County Planning Commission's proposed 2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendments. And I don't know how you wish to go forward on these. We could begin right from C-1 through C-4. And I have both Gary and Kirk here to elaborate on some details on each of those.

Chair Lohman: I would like to propose that we deal with C-1, C-2 and C-3, as they seem to be less controversial and the simplest, and then deal with C-4 last. Anybody else with an idea?

Keith Greenwood: Just for me, I think that dealing with C-2 and C-3 ahead of C-1 would be preferable, as far as the amount of review that might be involved.

Chair Lohman: Do the Parks and Recreation one first?

Mr. Greenwood: No. Do 2 and 3 and then proceed with 1 and 4 – only in the sense that C-1 I have some questions about that might be substantial.

Chair Lohman: Sounds fine.

Mr. Greenwood: Okay.

Mr. Easton: I need to make a point of clarification. One of the documents that the staff distributed today is four pages long and it's in an incorrect order. So if you take your public testimony section, the Planning Commission Public Hearing

2012 CPAs, just the public – the pages are out of order. Page 2 should be rearranged so you can read them, in case we're relying on those.

Mr. Greenwood: I'm not following you. Which –

Mr. Easton: They gave us a document that they called the Public – it says "Public Testimony Only" on the top. It's from the – from the last hearing. It's part of the transcript and the page orders are all flipped around so if you're trying to follow – if you're trying to read Randy's testimony – who was the first one who testified – when you flip to page 2 it's actually page 4 so you might want to reshuffle that.

Chair Lohman: I don't believe everybody got that.

Mr. Easton: Oh. Maybe I'm mistaken. This is one of the ones that I brought myself then and I put it in the wrong order. Disregard that! That was a big mistake – thank you. Well, now I can read in order the pages that I wanted to read. Thank you. That was fascinating!

Kevin Meenaghan: I would like to also mention that on the November 12th supplemental staff report in the draft recorded motion, the C-1 through C-4 are also in different orders.

Chair Lohman: Oh. That's why I was struggling with –

Mr. Easton: Ah, yes.

Mr. Greenwood: Oh, okay.

Mr. Meenaghan: I think what Keith is really trying to say is if we look at the November 12th supplemental staff report we want to look at C-2 and C-3, which is the Del Mar piece and the four – the zone code parcels in La Conner as one first.

Chair Lohman: So, staff –

Mr. Greenwood: The way they were presented to us initially.

Chair Lohman: Can we get the right C-1 – the right numbering then so they all match? Between your staff reports and our draft motion they all need to be the same.

Gary Christensen: I would suggest that you just read the proposal and not use the reference number.

Chair Lohman: I agree. We will. But can we also make sure the numbering –

Mr. Christensen: Yes.

Kirk Johnson: If I can interject: So the draft recorded motion is consistent with the County Commissioners' docketing resolution. So we had discovered the discrepancy in the staff report commenting on comments – responding to comments – so we think it would make the most sense to stick with the numbers that were in the docketing resolution and that are also in the draft recorded motion. And that memo that was handed out today is the one that's in error.

Chair Lohman: Okay.

Mr. Easton: So I would then say that we – I would agree in that we should just use the – just go from the 1 through 4 that are on the draft motion.

Chair Lohman: Okay, so, Keith, you want to group together the La Conner Rural Business properties and the Del Mar first, and then go to the Parks one and then Bayview Ridge following? Is that – okay, let's do it.

Robert Temples: Because they're actually – primarily they're correctional.

Chair Lohman: Okay. Who is presenting – you?

Mr. Johnson: No, I believe Gary is. I'm just going to pull up a map image when we're ready.

Mr. Easton: Madame Chair, I'm not sure we need a staff presentation on the first two given that staff's comments were really limited due to the fact that no one testified against either of the motions – or either of the sections.

Mr. Greenwood: I would tend to support that.

Chair Lohman: Are you –

Mr. Easton: I mean, it was just a suggestion. I mean, from a flow of meeting point of view, I mean, I don't have any need to hear from staff on these two.

Mr. Greenwood: If we could skip that, that would be –

Mr. Easton: Time-saving.

Chair Lohman: I think so.

Mr. Temples: And like I said, it's a correctional process really.

Chair Lohman: Okay, do we have a motion then from the Commission?

Mr. Johnson: So I can get the right image up, are you talking about the La Conner property or the Fidalgo Island property?

Mr. Easton: Both.

Mr. Johnson: Oh, both together?

Chair Lohman: Yeah.

Mr. Johnson: Okay.

Mr. Easton: So I'm going to make a motion if everyone's comfortable with that. I'm going to move – and I'm going to do it from the draft proposal, referencing the ones on the draft proposal. I won't read the numbers for lack – so we won't confuse – and I'll just read the titles. So I move that we accept the proposals as presented to us in relationship to the proposal to redesign and rezone – or redesignate; excuse me – and rezone four parcels – and I'm not going to read the P numbers – near La Conner to Rural Business, and I further move that the proposal to redesignate and rezone P118792, owned by Del Mar Community Services, from Rural Reserve-NRL to Rural Reserve.

Mr. Greenwood: I'll second that.

Chair Lohman: Okay, it's been moved and seconded to accept the proposal to redesignate the four parcels – and I *will* read them – P74450, P103560, P103559, P74451, near La Conner, to Rural Business, and the proposal to redesignate and rezone P118792, owned by Del Mar Community Service, from Rural Reserve-NRL to Rural Reserve. Discussion? Yeah?

Mr. Hughes: Rural Resource.

Chair Lohman: It says Rural Reserve.

Mr. Hughes: You said – both of you said Rural Reserve.

Chair Lohman: Oh, Rural Resource-NRL to Rural Reserve. Thank you for that catch.

Mr. Easton: So they were – to me, they're clearing up errors and I would further in my comments say that the findings of fact that are here listed in our draft proposal seem fitting to me for the issues at bay and set these issues aside as just basically glorified mapping errors.

Mr. Greenwood: Yeah, I'd like to just make one point of discussion. I know that – I remember one comment that was made last week about the Del Mar piece and how it was an example of how government and our process works, and I

was just a little disappointed that – it seems like a year-long or a long process to rectify something of the nature of this. It's .3 acres and there was a lot of paperwork and time spent to do this. I know there's a process to go through, but it kind of looked like it was a mapping error but it really wasn't. It was adjacent to another parcel that we changed the zoning on, so it did fit where it was attached to prior to and we isolated it when we rezoned the parcel to the west. So, I mean, it's a process that we go through but I don't think it's an example of government efficiency if that's the way we're looking at it.

Mr. Easton: Sounds good – no drum rolls!

Chair Lohman: Any more comments?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Okay, should we move to vote? All those in favor, say "aye."

Mr. Easton: Do we need a roll call on the motion? Last time Ryan asked for a roll call.

Chair Lohman: Dave, you want to say?

Mr. Hughes: Yep.

Matt Mahaffie: Yes.

Josh Axthelm: Yes.

Chair Lohman: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Yes.

Mr. Temples: Yes.

Mr. Meenaghan: Yes.

Mr. Greenwood: Yes.

Ms. Nakis: Yes.

Chair Lohman: None opposed. Okay, moving on to a proposal to incorporate into the Comprehensive Plan by reference the 2012 Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan. Do you want to have a staff report or do you want to move right into our deliberations?

Mr. Greenwood: I wouldn't mind a staff report.

Chair Lohman: Okay. Is that you, Gary?

Mr. Christensen: All right, let me introduce it for you then. I'll be reading from and paraphrasing from the November 12, 2013, supplemental staff report from Mr. Pernula to the Planning Commission and Interested Parties.

Beginning on page 2, then, is a proposal to amend Skagit County Comprehensive Plan to incorporate by reference the 2012 Skagit County Parks and Recreation Comp Plan. There were ten public comments, either oral or written testimony. What we have done in this supplemental staff report is by the commenter's name summarized their comments and then, where appropriate, have provided Departmental response.

I don't know if you want to go through these comment by comment?

Chair Lohman: I'm not sure that's necessary.

Mr. Christensen: I'm prepared to read it if you'd like me to read it to you.

Mr. Easton: I don't think *that's* necessary. I mean, it was sent to us previously and we got a chance to review it.

Mr. Greenwood: I don't think it needs to be read.

Chair Lohman: Okay. Why don't we just move right into deliberations? So do we have a motion?

Mr. Easton: Sure. I move that we recommend for approval to the Commissioners the proposal to incorporate into the Comprehensive Plan by reference the 2012 Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Lohman: Second?

Mr. Greenwood: Second.

Chair Lohman: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the proposal to incorporate into the Comprehensive Plan by reference the 2012 Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan. Discussion? Elinor?

Ms. Nakis: Yes, I'm still interested in finding out about the question that I asked last week about the two references to the Hansen Creek Park and if they're one and the same or if they're different, and where they're located. That's part of the Plan.

Mr. Easton: That can be a recall of the witness or the staff. Who wants to take the –

Mr. Mahaffie: I do.

Mr. Easton: Oh, do you know the answer?

Mr. Mahaffie: That question was brought up with the Capital Facilities portion of our discussion. It wasn't referencing –

Ms. Nakis: It was part of the Parks Plan.

Mr. Mahaffie: Yeah, but you had asked the question in reference to the Capital Facilities list.

Mr. Greenwood: Does the question still pertain, though, to this issue?

Mr. Mahaffie: It wasn't to anybody here. The question was asked to Ryan.

Mr. Easton: Oh, right. Oh, that's right.

Chair Lohman: I think Matt is correct.

Mr. Easton: Is there someone from the Department who might be prepared to answer the question?

Chair Lohman: Brian.

Brian Adams: Brian Adams. I'm the Skagit County Parks and Recreation Director. I'm not sure what the question was but I can assume that we have a park that in some of our listings it shows as Hansen Creek Park. Is that correct?

Ms. Nakis: I'll read the question.

Mr. Adams: Okay.

Ms. Nakis: It says, "Where is the Hansen Creek Reserve?" And "Is the Hansen Creek Reserve the same as the Hansen Creek Park?" Are they one and the same?

Mr. Adams: Well, they are both a part of a greater park called the Northern State Recreational Area. They were added later, and it's a small amount of acreage right on the creek so it's actually at this point part of the Northern State Recreational Area up near Sedro-Woolley – 726 acres up there in total.

Ms. Nakis: Can you locate it – I mean, on a map for me?

Mr. Adams: Can I locate it on a map? John, do you have – and is there a reason that we need to locate it on a map? I mean it's part of a 726-acre piece that also includes a major portion of Hansen Creek.

Ms. Nakis: I live on Hansen Creek.

Mr. Adams: Okay.

Ms. Nakis: And I've had many people come to my house asking me if I was the park. And at one time there was a map out that located that park on Fruitdale Road.

Mr. Adams: Yeah, it's been assimilated in.

Ms. Nakis: And I'm assuming that that property is what you're referring to, the Hansen Creek Reserve or Hansen Creek Park.

Mr. Adams: Yeah, I'm not sure. I've never heard anything referred to as a Hansen Creek Reserve. Patrik, do you have knowledge of that?

Patrik Dylan: Can I come up there to answer?

Mr. Adams: Please come up.

Mr. Dylan: Patrik Dylan with Eccos Design in Mount Vernon, Washington. I'm actually not familiar with the term "Hansen Creek Reserve" –

Ms. Nakis: It was in your documents that I read last week.

Mr. Greenwood: It's in your table.

Mr. Adams: It's in the table for the –

Mr. Greenwood: Table 3.5 on page 3-6.

Mr. Dylan: Let me look at that. But the Hansen Creek *Park* I am familiar with and that *is* the one on Fruitdale Road. It's a very small parcel – I think it's a couple acres – and I think it was initially a Public Works piece of property that was surplus and it kind of went into the Parks Department sometime in the late 1980s or early 1990s. It's never been developed or it's not really open for public use at this point.

Ms. Nakis: Have you looked at it?

Mr. Dylan: I have.

Ms. Nakis: What does it look like?

Mr. Dylan: It's just woods.

Ms. Nakis: Well, what I see when I walk down – and I walk there everyday almost – is on **Fidalgo** I see a big cliff and it starts about seven feet away from the edge of Fidalgo.

Mr. Dylan: Sure, sure.

Ms. Nakis: I've seen more and more roots from the trees that are right there next to it and they're about ready to fall in, and there's a big logjam at the base of it, and it's at least 100 feet high – probably 150 feet high – and so I look at it not as any way possible as park in the future anytime. Probably just open space, certainly not property that I would probably put in the Parks Plan – plan of development. I mean, it has been no – nothing done with it.

Mr. Adams: Because a lot of critical area gets placed in open space or a greenbelt or part of a park, it doesn't mean that it's going to have any kind of park amenity at any point. It probably won't even have a trail – it's that steep – but it is just an aesthetic kind of a – part of a park and it's a part of now the Northern State Recreational Area. My assumption is, you know, Public Works didn't have any plans for it either and so because it was adjacent or near Northern State Recreational Area it was just added.

Ms. Nakis: It is totally surrounded by private property.

Mr. Adams: Oh, that – see, I'm not aware of that. Patrik was here at that time. I was not a part of the Parks Department. But I think that we probably count it as part of the 726 acres. It won't have any amenity. We couldn't permit probably anything ever to go in there. It's just a – it's just a visual piece.

Ms. Nakis: Once again I'm still asking that same question: Is the Hansen Creek Reserve that was noted in your chart, is it the same as the Hansen Creek Park or are those two different pieces of property on Hansen Creek? They're both listed at 3 acres.

Mr. Adams: I'm not – you know, our park historian is John Semrau and I'm wondering if he has any thoughts as far as that goes. He's been on the Parks Board for twenty-five years.

Mr. Greenwood: You'll find it on page 3-6 at the table and 3-12 is the photograph with the description of the Hansen Creek Park.

Mr. Easton: Elinor, while they've considering to look, would – a potential solution might be that you could recommend that they remove it, as a recommendation following our approval of the – like a finding of fact or a recommendation that we could make. You could make a recommendation if you, obviously, get the rest of us to agree, that could be part of the record. Maybe have it removed from the inventory.

Ms. Nakis: Okay.

Mr. Easton: Because I think, with all due respect to the staff, you understand this particular spot as it relates to this Plan maybe a little better than they can on short recall. It might be the best way for us to handle it from a time point of view.

Ms. Nakis: Well, I asked that question last week to ask them to bring that to me so it doesn't make it back in their reports.

Mr. Easton: Right. The problem is – and I totally respect their time – they left after their section and then – Matt's right – it came up after they weren't in the room so we made the mistake of thinking they were going to be prepared for this question when they actually aren't.

Ms. Nakis: Oh. Okay.

Mr. Easton: With no disrespect.

Mr. Adams: No, I appreciate it. You know, this is part of –

Mr. Easton: Maybe we could recommend that you remove it.

Mr. Adams: This is a part of the process that helps us delve into these kind of issues and make sure that they're dealt with.

Mr. Easton: It's a valid point.

Mr. Adams: And I appreciate you being a neighbor with that kind of knowledge because I've looked at that and it's unfair for me to pull something out that I, you know – I mean, I realize that in my questioning of that property it was always thought to be a part of the Northern State Recreational Area. You know, we've never had any plan with that. We've got property up in Marblemount that we don't have any plans for that is in the critical areas. It's on a river, too, and we just – it doesn't behoove us to spend a lot of time chasing it down. But we appreciate those that have knowledge of it.

Mr. Easton: Maybe a clarification before it goes to the Commissioners for approval, and a recommendation from us to remove it would be sufficient. I don't know. It's a suggestion.

Ms. Nakis: My concern is that it's somewhat of a liability because it's eating away and eventually it will eat away into Fruitdale Road and it will be a cost to the County. Right now we have a problem with the lower part of Fruitdale Road where it's totally gone so we now have to take another route to get places.

Mr. Easton: I mean, the Commissioner makes a good point. It is part of their inventory, but maybe noting it to the public as being – maybe it needs to be labeled more appropriately so that it doesn't appear to be a park.

Mr. Adams: Yes, and we can make sure – we can absolutely –

Mr. Easton: And it surely doesn't appear to be a part of Northern State. No offense to the Director, but I would never have figured out that that was a part of Northern State.

Mr. Adams: Well, Hansen Creek runs right through _____.

Mr. Easton: But I mean I just don't think I would have tied those two together.

Mr. Adams: And we will thank you and bring that up with the Risk Manager and make sure that there are no risks that might be associated with the public.

Ms. Nakis: Thank you.

Mr. Greenwood: I just want to bring up – there might be a simple clarification, and if they are one and the same if you just were to change the name in the photograph and the description to Hansen Creek Reserve so it's reflective of the same description and title as the table, then it would be a _ a reserve or open space reserve rather than a park.

Mr. Adams: That's a simple adjustment.

Mr. Johnson: I haven't done it before but I could do live edits, like you did with the Capital Facilities Plan. There were a number of recommendations that you made that went into the recorded motion. So if you want to do that....

Chair Lohman: Elinor, do you have some proposed language?

Ms. Nakis: No.

Mr. Easton: We could start with Keith's. I mean I think to start with Keith's would be good.

Mr. Greenwood: I'd like to move that we clarify the language in reference to Hansen Creek so it's consistent between Park and Reserve in the document. Is that clear enough?

Ms. Nakis: I guess unless those two parcels are separate.

Mr. Easton: I'd further add – well, I'll wait till he catches up. This is probably another point. It'd be separate from this one. We recommend that the Department review with Risk Assessment – the Risk Assessment folks – the right way to label the park in question.

Chairman Lohman: And classify.

Mr. Easton: To classify the park in question.

Chair Lohman: Because as we heard and read, it isn't all just what's under your boots recreational opportunities. Open space could be viewed as just a – would be actually a habitat.

Mr. Easton: Elinor touches on an important facet of issues that have come up all the way back to issues with people using dikes as trails. And all the way back to the trail plan the first time I ever heard Josh testify so eloquently concerning dikes and people using them as trails through private property without any – with a lot of disregard for people's private property rights. So it's extremely important that the Department – I'm not going to do this in the form of a recommendation but I just want to remind the Department and the members of the Parks group that are here how we communicate to the public, what words we choose to use when we label things make a difference about whether people are misunderstanding what's a park and what's not. Because you do end up with people who think that Elinor lives in a park.

Chair Lohman: But there was a reference to the Open Space Plan and incorporating it into the Park Plan, and I have a little bit of reservation about that because there was a lot of conceptual ideas in the Open Space Plan and a lot of wishes, I guess, and a lot of it was centered around trails, and there was a lot of art – more art-type drawings rather than actual maps. And I don't want to mislead somebody when you incorporate a conceptual idea like that into a plan that has more detail and is actually more ground-truthed.

Mr. Easton: Can the Director come to the microphone, please?

Mr. Adams: Sure.

Mr. Easton: So as clearly and succinctly as possible, Mr. Adams, can you tell us *exactly* what you expect the relationship between the Open Space Plan and the Parks Plan to be?

Mr. Adams: You know, I think that was brought up by someone else from the public, Jeroldine Hallberg. We, as a Parks staff, didn't make any kind of recommendation of any sort.

Mr. Easton: And so that's not a part of this document then?

Mr. Adams: It's not a part of the document.

Mr. Easton: Okay. Thanks for clarifying that.

Chair Lohman: I just had to say it out loud.

Mr. Easton: That's good. I just wanted him on the record saying out loud that's not a part.

Chair Lohman: Anything else on the Parks?

Mr. Axthelm: One thing I would like to see is if the open space – I've seen a couple references – there're some references to open space here – when it's referred to in the Parks Plan, the words "*public* open space" is put before it, because there's public open space and there's private open space and there's a big difference between those two.

Mr. Easton: So you're asking them to edit it so that – you're asking for a recommendation for editing them?

Mr. Axthelm: If you're referring to Parks and Recreation, that is referring to *public* open space.

Mr. Adams: It is.

Mr. Axthelm: Not private.

Mr. Adams: Right.

Mr. Axthelm: Then it needs to be differentiated and *clearly* called out in the Plan.

Mr. Easton: And that's got to be a recommendation.

Mr. Adams: And you'll make that form of a recommendation?

Mr. Easton: I would think so because we're asking the Commissioners to ask the Department to do that. So, I mean, that's a significant change to the document.

Mr. Adams: Sure.

Mr. Easton: Don't you agree, Josh?

Mr. Axthelm: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Although one that I don't think would rise to the level of needing to have another public hearing or anything to that.

Mr. Adams: No, that's housecleaning that we can take care of.

Mr. Johnson: I don't think I caught all the nuances, but –

Mr. Easton: Ask Josh.

Mr. Axthelm: Yes, referring to public open space ___.

Mr. Easton: Do you have *that* in their toys?

Mr. Johnson: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: So I have a fourth recommendation, Madame Chair.

Chair Lohman: Go ahead.

Mr. Easton: I want to commend you all for the work that you've done on this, but I also want on the record – there was some people who felt – we heard two totally different sides of the story about public input, and so I just want to make sure that we kind of/sort of from this Planning Commissioner's point of view codify the fact that we would encourage the Department – the Parks Department – to continue to look for creative ways to involve the public in future updates. I just want to acknowledge the fact that some people felt – some people who are really a part of the system really felt like they did an amazing job of public outreach and, like John said – I think you said of all the years you've been involved that this was, you know, like a banner participation. The flip side is we heard some testimony from people who just felt like they didn't know anything about this Plan as it was coming together. So we need to continue – all of us need to continue to work for – to try to make sure, so I would encourage the Department to look for creative ways to involve the public as the plans are updated. And I mean that with respect to you guys and all the work you do.

Chair Lohman: But I think part of the problem was the lag time between when you did the bulk of your work and when it gets scheduled to be docketed, and then by the time it reaches us tonight.

Mr. Easton: Which is tough because of the way that the Comp Plan Amendments schedules work there's really only this narrow period of time where we actually do these.

Chair Lohman: So it almost in a way paints a false illusion that there was a large idle time, when possibly there wasn't.

Mr. Adams: Right. Yeah, the process takes a lot of time – more time than we would like at times as well. This is something that I've brought up in different meetings with other Parks Directors over the years all over the state. They have, you know, similar issues and try to get as creative as they can to get others involved, but as much as they try to oftentimes we end up with the same thing. In fact, they were commending us for how much participation that we got at these public meetings, where even in these very large communities they oftentimes don't get as much as they would like. So we reach out with a number of different – in a number of different ways, whether it's surveys, public input, public meetings, Park Board meetings, making sure that we're allowing our Commissioners and staff to weigh in to let our Park Board talk to their constituents. But there's always room to go back in another six years and say, Hey, what can we do this time to make sure that we're _____.

Mr. Easton: And forgive me for not knowing the answer to this: Do you guys utilize Channel 21 and the website as much as you think you could? Because we've seen a big spike over the two or three years that we've now been on TV. It's changed public participation levels. Have you guys – because you can do floor meetings. It's a little more work for the Department but you can do floor meetings here televised.

Mr. Adams: You know, I've talked with the Commissioners and they said, Hey, look, you're located close to this building now. You know, in the future we can utilize this room for some of our Parks Board meetings when they carry more weight.

Mr. Easton: Excellent.

Mr. Adams: So I think that's something we would consider doing.

Mr. Easton: Perfect. Thank you.

Mr. Greenwood: Can I bring up a point along those lines? I hope the people aren't upset with what might seem like dragging this process even further when there's been a lot of public participation and scoping. I think that's been really good. But what I think we'll find is that when you advertise a potato farmer's plan for the next twenty years you'll get a bunch of people who are interested in potatoes and farming to participate in the development of that project and that document. And then when you put it out before the rest of the public, which

would be the Planning Commission, I'm thinking is a different audience. So you bring up – you're going to get a lot of good input from people who are interested in parks and recreation when you talk about parks and recreation. Other people might turn off or not even turn it on in the first place. So there are other avenues perhaps, but I think you've gone through the process properly. It's just that there might be some different comments coming from a different angle, if you will, as it relates to it – because we're talking about incorporating it into the Comprehensive Plan for the whole county, not just those who are interested in parks and recreation.

Mr. Easton: There was very little positive experience that I had with the Open Space Plan. I found the process to be, like, maddening at one point. We had a consultant in the room. We asked for changes to the map. The staff member announced publicly that we'd outspent our budget already six months ago and we weren't sure we could afford to even change the maps, which was really partially early on in my time here on the Commission and it was a frustrating moment of understanding that we were sort of being put in what felt like a rubber stamp point of view. There was one part of Open Space that was extremely helpful. You might consider taking the Plan before us in as a, you know, work session setting one time before you guys vote on it and then send it in for its update in the future. And that is because it's a televised session and because there's a lot more freedom for people to be able to ask questions, and what we were able to do – and Jeroldine was right – we were able to walk around large maps and ask questions. This is where those kinds of questions about where Elinor's kind of question would come up. So that could be extremely, I think, useful in the future.

Mr. Adams: I appreciate that.

Mr. Easton: And I think Keith is right. You get a different group of people watching this televised event than you might in just a mailer that invites people to a Parks and Rec meeting, et cetera. Call for the question?

Mr. Greenwood: Um. Well. I guess you can do that.

Mr. Easton: I didn't mean to cut you off. Sorry.

Mr. Greenwood: I see a lot of opportunities for improvement in the document itself and some of the public comments make mention of some of those areas of significant change. There's – some of it is small – editorial corrections; some of it's a point of view or perspective that the document starts with. And I understand that it's coming from a different perspective and so I would expect some of those things, but there's a lot of reference to – historically – to intruders. There's reference to development. We're calling agricultural enhancement, conversion, development. It paints a pretty negative picture on our county and it also – there's places – well, chapter 5 I'm going to say is the chapter that I struggle with

the most, primarily because it starts out with several paragraphs and quotes pertaining to the entire state. And they don't necessarily pertain to our county. Our county is unique. It's different than King County and Snohomish and Pierce County and places that have already developed. And it talks about those in many cases where it makes reference to the fact that our – many of our estuaries and areas for wildlife purposes are in outstanding condition or in good condition, and yet at the same time it's talking about how we need to save more because it's in bad condition and it talks about agriculture in a negative light. It talks about private versus public ownership in a different light. Uses the – talks about wildlife in the perspective that, for example, big game needs public protection; otherwise it won't do well. And, as a matter of fact, most of the elk, for example, is on private property doing quite, quite well – so well that we've had to enhance the harvest so that they don't tear up what we've got growing in our field on forestland. A lot of – it also needs to be incorporated that a lot of open space *is* private but available for recreational use. There's a lot of land use policies that might require people to be on foot or horseback or bicycle, but hunting and fishing is permitted. So those are open spaces. If you think that the public – just using the Forest Service and the National Park as an example as a place to recreate, more and more the limitations are becoming quite extensive. There's going to be more and more foot traffic, bicycle traffic and the like because many of the roads are being abandoned, closed up on the park system, as well as the national forest.

So I find there's a lot of suggested changes to chapter 5, so I'd like that to be reworked before it becomes included by reference into the Comprehensive Plan, and I'd be happy to provide some comment to that. Or remove that section and then add it later when it's been worked through a little bit. And I can give you some examples, if you'd like.

Mr. Adams: Right. And we did remove four paragraphs. You probably saw –

Mr. Greenwood: I did see.

Mr. Adams: – some of those paragraphs we did remove. We did have a later conversation with – about that at a Parks Board meeting. You know, I've looked back through it, too. I think that if we were to go back through this in six years – and we talked about this, John and I and Patrik and others – that that chapter could be much more reduced. I think there was a time where Parks probably played a bigger role in that kind of component, but now there's a Natural Resource section of Skagit County. But by saying that I also think that it's important – there's an important interface between recreation and some of the lands that we utilize, and some of those lands have different type of wildlife and a lot of different ways in which we interface with plants and whatever animals are out there, and I think it's important to have some of that information in there. I don't think it needs to be our primary concern because there is a Natural Resource division of Public Works. But I do agree that we could go back through

that and reduce it. I don't – I think it would be unfair to the people that were involved with the process coming up to this point to suddenly jerk some of that information out there when they've been talking about it and dealing with this for a long period of time. And that's how I felt about the Plan all along. You know, this is an update and there's been a lot of people and a lot of involvement over the years by a lot of different people, and I'm always afraid to suddenly have some knee jerk reactions at the end and pull that out. But I think that if we went into the process and really focused on that in the future when we did a big – our next update – and I think that would be a good place to start reducing.

Chair Lohman: I also had some trouble with elements in chapter 5. I understand why you have chapter 5 and I did go back and read even further than this update. But there's a little bit of opinion mixed with the detail, and that's the part that gave me a lot of trouble. And I agree with your strikes. I liked what you struck but I think you could have struck more or possibly reworded it. You talked quite a bit, especially in the estuarine habitat, which is where the delta – the ag deltas – are. It talked a lot about the Pacific Coast Joint Venture Group and the flyways, but you're silent on the contribution that that vast agricultural delta in the Samish and the Skagit provide. And I think while you castigate agriculture on one side you've got to praise us on the other because we're providing a lot of habitat and a lot of open space view.

Mr. Easton: Ask the swans.

Mr. Adams: Right. Yeah, and this was – you know, that chapter was added – and, John, correct me if I'm wrong – in 1998. That was fifteen years ago, and primarily what we've done is updated that chapter with demographic information or – you know, we haven't really changed or morphed that much more than those type of things, but I think that we could. I think that – and there has been a lot of change between 1998 and now and I think that it wouldn't be a bad idea. But, again, there's been so much process involved – so many different groups over the years that have been involved with the updates that, again, it's – I don't feel as a Director sometimes it's my job to – you know, if that comes from a grassroots effort early on in the process that's one thing because there's a lot of different people that have a chance to weigh in, and that just didn't happen.

Chair Lohman: Jason.

Mr. Easton: Well, so the Director and I are on different pages when it comes to the decisions about our responsibility in relationship to this. Long processes – you're in a room full of a process that's been going on since the '50s or the '60s for our next item, so we're very familiar with how long some things can take to finally develop. I feel no force of compulsion on myself to approve this Plan or any plan that comes before me just because it's been going on for a long time and a lot of people gave input. The nine of us, because of the amount of volunteer time we give and because of the clear mandate we're given from the

Commissioners to be their eyes and ears, we could fully feel comfortable – I could fully feel comfortable – accepting a recommendation to strike all of chapter 5. It's a recommendation only –

Mr. Adams: Right.

Mr. Easton: – but regardless of the fact it's been worked on for so long.

Mr. Adams: Sure.

Mr. Easton: What it would – I mean, we don't have an attorney – I don't believe we have any of our attorneys here today, but I do feel very comfortable that if that recommendation did go forward and it was accepted by the Commissioners, you would have to go back to another public hearing. That would be too significant of a change, I would think, for it to not trigger that. I mean, I'm not one of the attorneys, but from what Ryan has told us over the years it's called "significant difference," and I don't know how you define that but taking a whole chapter out seems like that would rise to that level. So that may be a factor in what the Commissioners decide.

The length of the document or how long it's taken to have it contribute, it does cross this one line that really makes me uncomfortable and that is there's no reason to castigate agriculture in this county.

Mr. Adams: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Easton: Ever, in my opinion. So if we're – you know, if we can find a way for – and we have found a way to do some amazing things where – at the corner of Parks, preservation of livestock and agriculture and preservation of everything that has to do with fish and wildlife. They all can seem to live together in some pretty amazing ways, particularly – and I was sort of joking when I said look at the swans, but it's really a great example actually, where all of that sort of comes together.

I appreciate the Director's comments. I will support – I would support a recommendation to remove chapter 5, if you want to go in that direction.

Mr. Greenwood: I was going to make that motion that we strike chapter 5, as part of our motion to accept.

Mr. Easton: Part of our recommendations?

Mr. Greenwood: Yes.

Mr. Easton: I'll second that motion. I guess it would be an amendment.

Mr. Greenwood: Amendment to your –

Mr. Easton: Madame Chair, would it be an amendment?

Chair Lohman: No.

Mr. Axthelm: If we go around we'll still have opportunity to discuss it, because I do have a few comments.

Mr. Easton: I do think it should be in the form of an amendment so that we can go into discussion about it.

Mr. Greenwood: Yeah, we could just move on this amendment, right?

Chair Lohman: Right.

Mr. Greenwood: Vote on this amendment?

Mr. Easton: Right.

Chair Lohman: Right.

Mr. Easton: And not take the other issue up yet – the rest of the document up.

Chair Lohman: So do you want to vote on this amendment to strike chapter 5?

Mr. Greenwood: I'd be fine with that.

Mr. Easton: We should probably have discussion.

Chair Lohman: Oh – discussion.

Mr. Greenwood: I'll only – I guess and one other thing is I'd be more than happy to provide some editorial notes. They're all in pencil so far with x's and things like that, so they're not as clear as they certainly should be. But there's enough of a conflict in this particular section that castigates even Parks and Recreation. It talks negatively about trails. It talks negatively about people viewing wildlife and the consequences of that, when I actually think that the more people are involved through education and visiting and seeing, which is what they really want. They want to see wildlife. They don't want to just know that it's there. Like grizzly bears: How many of them are out there actually? There's been, like, one photographic sight which was the first one in fifty years. So people really don't see them. It's kind of nice to know that they're there, perhaps, but I just think that the more education people get about wildlife the more they want to conserve them. The more they see the outdoors the more they want to conserve the outdoors. The park – there's all kinds of backpacking trails in the Forest Service

land and all over the place. We've got some real great ones here. But that's not the type of trails that most of the population accesses. They access Little Mountain trails and the Cascade Trail and places that really are closer to them and give them a chance to get out there, whether it's via wheelchair or bicycle with their kids or hiking. So we have great opportunities out there in this county. And I think it's different than other counties and I'd like for us to be able to take credit for that and have the document be consistent and reflective of that open space that we already have.

Mr. Easton: I don't have any further comments here.

Chair Lohman: Anybody down here? Matt?

Mr. Mahaffie: I think striking it completely is taking it a little far. I like the idea of some editorial comments. I understand the purpose of why it's here – the need for it to be here in the chapter. But, I mean, just for example: "In 2011, warnings were sent out to several cattle ranchers and fines have been placed on two cattle ranchers who refused to act on those warnings." It's just in the middle of the paragraph. There's no reason for that statement to be there.

Mr. Adams: And that was removed. That's been removed. It's not removed from your document but we did take four paragraphs out, including that.

Mr. Greenwood: Well, if you want to do it paragraph by paragraph there are some paragraphs that I'm okay with but I wouldn't mind a vetting process.

Mr. Easton: You need to withdraw –

Mr. Greenwood: I'd rather take out and have them reworked.

Mr. Easton: From a parliamentary point of view, you'd have to – if you're going to go that direction, you need to withdraw your motion then.

Mr. Greenwood: And I don't want to do that.

Chair Lohman: Well –

Mr. Temples: And I'm also concerned about – that you mentioned whether our attorney would consider that too much.

Mr. Easton: (unintelligible)

Mr. Meenaghan: And along those lines, I'm curious what removal of chapter 5 does to the rest of the document, and what effect it has.

Mr. Temples: Mm, yeah.

Mr. Adams: I think that there's a lot of statistical – good statistical information in there, a lot of – you know, I've read through it again and, you know, I brought up this proposal that you're talking about – hey, what if we were just to remove chapter 5? – at our last – was it two Parks Board meetings ago? And the Parks Board ended up not being comfortable with that. I think that in the end they were comfortable with removing some of the language that got added in. You know, we sent this chapter over to our own Natural Resource division of Public Works to look at it and there was some information added that again was later removed at that last meeting, and so that's where that came about and that's where that was removed. But there wasn't interest in the Parks Board of removing that chapter completely. They were comfortable with what was _____.

Mr. Easton: Here's the weird – here is odd spot we're left with, right? So we have a Director who agrees with us that parts of chapter 5 needed to be removed and that – I mean, some it happened already.

Mr. Adams: Right.

Mr. Easton: He also agrees with us that it probably doesn't flow as well as it should, probably should have different choices of language. He seems to understand that that's the case. You've even went as far as asking the Parks Board to consider removing it completely, which is what we're discussing now. But if we fail or if we fail to act on this or the Commissioners fail to agree with us, we're staying with that for six years. And so I don't think – maybe there needs to be a – is there some other type of suggestion that could be made? Are we precluded from doing a Comp Plan Amendment on chapter 5 only next year as a County request outside of the regular update cycle? Could the Planning – could the Parks Department come to the Planning – file with the Commissioners like internally is done, and could they revisit just chapter – say just chapter 5 next year? Maybe that could be a compromise.

Mr. Pernula: I believe the answer would be that it would have to be with the 2013 docketed items. We only can make one Comprehensive Plan Amendment per year.

Mr. Easton: That's what I meant.

Mr. Pernula: It would have to be next year ____.

Mr. Easton: To be in this process that we're in right now a year from now.

Mr. Greenwood: Would – I guess – would removal of chapter 5 – would that preclude you from securing the necessary matching funds if the County in the next six years wanted to acquire some essential habitat?

Mr. Adams: It would not.

Mr. Greenwood: Then I think an amendment later on next year's docket to add some reworking of the chapter 5 – the subject matter anyway – that's a little more accurate in its reflection could be an amendment next year to this same Plan. I mean, I just – there's too many problems for me. If I were to start on the first page, the first quote is not Skagit County. It deals with the state. And it's not reflective of the county. The second quote: "Public acquisition and development programs have not kept pace with the state's Hispanic population." That's not Skagit County. "Private investment employment opportunities in general and the tourist industry in particular are dependent upon the continued availability of recreational opportunities in our state's unique natural environment." That's not Skagit County. That's the state, okay? And it doesn't – our county is unique and our county has not over-developed yet. We're actually to, Where are we going to put our industrial? Where are we going to put our residential? So we've got open space already and, not that I want it to go unplanned, but I'd like it to be reflective of our current desire for a healthy economy, open space-type agriculture. There's negative connotations to our oil industry/refinery industry in here – that it's a significant risk to what's going on here. Anyway I just think that there's too many changes for me to accept it at this point.

Mr. Johnson: Could I offer a suggestion? It hasn't been asked for. But I feel pretty comfortable in saying that the attorneys would say that removing an entire chapter would be a significant change. And so if the County Commissioners were to consider accepting that recommendation from the Planning Commission it would need to hold another public comment period. So there probably still is time before the end of the year to do that. There may also be time, if you wanted to make a recommendation of this sort, that some members or a majority – it remains to be seen – of the Planning Commission has concerns about the language of chapter 5 and you would like to see the Parks Department or you would recommend that the Parks Department develop a revised draft that it feels addresses some of those concerns, and then if there's time before the end of the year that it be put out for public review and comment with an opportunity for the Commissioners still to take advantage of this one opportunity to change the Comprehensive Plan.

So it seems like whether you're taking chapter 5 out or trying to come up with a better chapter 5, I think either one would require another public comment period. It could be before the County Commissioners; in fact, there's probably *only* time for it to be before the County Commissioners and get it done before the end of the year.

Mr. Greenwood: I would like this listening audience or this audience that is looking at this document – I'm going to say – for the first time or almost the first time to have a chance to make sure that it's reflective of the desires of the county. Like I said, I really think you've taken great steps to get public input, but

it's a different public. You know, even though it's open to everybody it's not everybody has contributed who has interest in it.

Mr. Axthelm: My feeling with the Parks and Recreation Plan is that it should be for public use and not necessarily for protecting the habitats. I think there's too much emphasis in this Plan, in this section of the Plan, on the habitat and on species. And we've been bombarded the last few years with Protect the habitat, Protect the species, and that's important. It's important that we mesh, but more emphasis needs to be on being able to use that land. I think there's a lot of land that's protected. There's a lot of habitat that we can't access. But the public land talked about by Parks and Recreation needs to be usable land, needs to be for the public to enjoy, the public to use. We can't protect everything 100%, and if, for example, a shoreline, if you have to stay 200 feet back from a shoreline or 100 feet back from a shoreline – whatever it happens to be – because they want to protect that land, you can't use it; you can't see it; you can't enjoy it. And, you know, I remember a time when my kids could go out to the ocean or go out to the parks and put their hands down in the tide pools. Now I understand that's not the best thing to do anymore but yet at some point they have to be able to see it and touch it and know what it is. And if we protect all our land and protect all that habitat to the extent that we can't get in there and use it, that's too much. And Parks and Recreation, in my opinion, does not have any part to protect it to that extent.

Chair Lohman: Matt?

Mr. Mahaffie: Just a comment to Josh and Keith. I kind of feel like you're shooting the messenger over here at the Parks Department. A lot of this, especially the first page, it's not their directive. It's what the state is telling them. Keith, Skagit County is blessed. That's the first line of the paragraph.

Mr. Greenwood: That's right. Sure.

Mr. Mahaffie: Things that reference Washington, it's to me – I'm taking it as – it's an explanation of why they're doing this. I don't feel that it's saying something bad about Skagit County or casting Skagit County in a negative light. It's Washington has passed a law. The legislature passed a law. Here is the reason why.

Mr. Greenwood: But don't use it as an excuse. New York doesn't have the type of blessing that we have or Alaska has, but they're telling Alaska how to manage their property and I don't appreciate that. That's why I don't think a statewide initiative or interest to protect habitat's great because you've depleted them in some areas. But that doesn't mean we have to do it all here.

Chair Lohman: On a different track, I believe that you have a typo right above where the red strike proposal on Appendix A that you gave us last time. You

have “conversion to agri-“ – on the first line, “despite the results of diking and drainage,” you have agriculture misspelled there. And I also have a problem when you have “experts feel.” That’s kind of like really poor writing, so we should probably – I see a whole bunch of edits, but again I also see the value of having elements of this chapter in there. So the dilemma is do we start editing the devil out of it or do we just kick it out and say it really needs more work and refinement? I don’t think killing chapter 5 and not ever having chapter 5 back is the answer, but I think chapter 5 needs some definite work.

Mr. Adams: I agree.

Chair Lohman: Matt?

Mr. Mahaffie: _____. This is an evolving document over years. I mean, we’re just at one step. It’s not like we’re not going to come back to this in six years. It’s ever going to be evolving. I’m just kind of taking it with a grain of salt that it’s going to be back before us again. I mean they *will* have an opportunity to address these concerns.

Mr. Temples: And if we can bring it back next year. I mean, to try to get this completed before the end of this year – we’re already in the middle of November. It’s not realistic. It’s not going to happen, in my opinion.

Chair Lohman: So we have a live motion on the table to strike chapter 5.

Mr. Easton: Amendment to the motion.

Chair Lohman: Amendment. So are we finished with discussion?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: So shall we vote? All those in favor, say “aye.”

Mr. Easton, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Greenwood, Chair Lohman, Mr. Axthelm and Mr. Meenaghan: Aye.

Chair Lohman: All those opposed, say “nay.”

Mr. Temples, Ms. Nakis and Mr. Mahaffie: Nay

Chair Lohman: Okay, all those who say “aye,” raise your hand.

Mr. Easton: Six-three.

Chair Lohman: Did you get everybody, Dale?

Mr. Pernula: It was six-three.

Chair Lohman: Okay.

Mr. Easton: With Matt, Robert and Elinor as the nays.

Mr. Easton: Shall I call the question for the rest of the motion?

Chair Lohman: Is there any further discussion on the rest of the proposal?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Okay, seeing none, shall we vote? All those in favor, say "aye."

Mr. Easton: Don't we have to do a roll call on this one?

Chair Lohman: All right. All those in favor?

Mr. Hughes: Yes.

Mr. Mahaffie: Yes.

Mr. Axthelm: Yes.

Chair Lohman: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Yes.

Mr. Temples: Yes.

Mr. Meenaghan: Yes.

Mr. Greenwood: Yes.

Ms. Nakis: Yes.

Chair Lohman: All yeses; no nos. Okay, moving on to...

Mr. Johnson: There're really – there aren't any recommendations or language that backs up the motion to remove chapter 5, so do you want that just reflected as a recommendation? Or do you want staff to draw on, you know, the transcript to indicate some of the reasons?

Chair Lohman: Well, let's write our – let's do our own writing. I think it's good for the Commission to write our own words. So item number 5.

Mr. Easton: Maybe we could encapsulate that? Isn't number 5 just the basic justification?

Mr. Greenwood: Right now you're thinking what's the justification for it?

Chair Lohman: Well, there were too many errors.

Mr. Greenwood: Sure. No, that's okay. In order to accurately reflect the county history and the county current condition and the Comprehensive Plan for consistency, chapter 5, dealing with fish and wildlife habitat conservation, should be reworked so that it – in order to – I wouldn't want to have to type with everybody watching! – should be reworked and resubmitted for adoption in the Parks and Rec Comprehension Plan. Is that close?

Mr. Easton: Works for me. Number 6.

Chair Lohman: Wait.

Mr. Easton: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you had finished it – sorry.

Chair Lohman: Let the Commission have a moment to see what we end up with here.

Mr. Axthelm: Do we want to put some reasons in there?

Chair Lohman: Do you mean like some bullets?

Mr. Axthelm: Instead of just a statement. Yeah.

Mr. Easton: In addition to the accuracy and the current conditions?

Mr. Axthelm: Emphasize what items that we have concerns with. It seems like there's a varying –

Mr. Greenwood: Like examples or –

Mr. Axthelm: Yeah. Either examples or, you know, just bullet points on this section. What – is the section overall a problem or is there just certain parts of it?

Mr. Greenwood: Certain parts of it.

Mr. Axthelm: Yeah.

Mr. Greenwood: It's the tone in the parts of it. The public has brought up some. There've been some negotiations ___ between staff, so some language has

already been proposed and accepted for removal in the staff report. And there would be further recommendations for – at least coming from me – for changes within the document.

Chair Lohman: Okay, you threw a whole bunch of stuff there, so let's get back up to number 5. These would be bullet points under 5.

Mr. Easton: I don't think adding the – I mean, can we kind of ____?

Mr. Greenwood: I categorized them as reflect county history and condition and goals maybe?

Mr. Easton: So let's reflect on the fact that this is – I disagree with Josh. A point by point here – this is being sent to the Commissioners. They're going to make an overall decision. If they do send it back to the Parks Department, the Parks Department participated in this conversation, have access to the transcript. I mean, I'm not sure it's helpful for us to go into a lengthy list of these points to the Commissioners, but that's my opinion.

Mr. Greenwood: But at some point they will need to know what those recommended changes are and know where that is in the process.

Mr. Easton: If they direct them to rewrite chapter 5. They'd have to agree to do this in the first place.

Mr. Greenwood: Okay. Because if you just go back to the same public that drafted the document you may end up with _____.

Mr. Easton: So ultimately our recommendations – I mean, ultimately these recommendations are used to try to convince the Commissioners to follow our advice, so if you feel like listing some of the reasons why it's helpful to get the Commissioners to agree to it then maybe it does make sense to add them to the list. Derogatory language against the agriculture is going to hit very squarely with a number of our Commissioners.

Mr. Greenwood: Well, that would work. We could put that in as an example.

Mr. Easton: As an example, those references that are derogatory towards agriculture.

Mr. Greenwood: Agriculture and industry.

Mr. Easton: And industry – need to be reconsidered.

Mr. Greenwood: Agriculture, industry and Parks and Rec. It's actually derogatory towards Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Easton: Any other examples? Well, Josh talked about the overemphasis of habitat.

Chair Lohman: Dale?

Mr. Axthelm: Yeah, that, to me –

Chair Lohman: One second.

Mr. Pernula: If this is a recommendation to the Board, I would recommend that you keep it as simple as possible so that if you do come back you can identify the areas that you really want to change later. But I'd also recommend that you recommend to the Board how they should deal with it. Do you want them to deal with it with the next docket or what? Just so that it's just not hanging there as a document that the Parks and Recreation Commission and Department and the Board has adopted separate from what you're adopting.

Chair Lohman: I think the Commission, though – we belabored the idea that with or without chapter 5 you could still move forward – the Parks and Rec Department – correct?

Mr. Easton: Historically when we disagree with staff it's not always their strength to point out to the Commissioners what points we raised that disagreed with them, so it might be a good spot to say the Director's on record saying that grant money would not be lost if chapter 5 is removed. I mean, the Commission – that was one of the questions that was brought up. I mean, I think the Commissioners are going to have that question.

Mr. Greenwood: A finding of fact.

Mr. Easton: A finding of fact that the Director has indicated – I mean, I'm not misstating what you said, am I?

Mr. Adams: No.

Mr. Easton: Okay. So one finding of fact would be that – would you do it as a finding of fact probably more than a recommendation, Dale?

Mr. Pernula: I would – yes.

Mr. Easton: All right, so we need to jump up to Finding of Fact.

Chair Lohman: Removal of chapter 5 doesn't jeopardize...

Mr. Easton: In his opinion wouldn't jeopardize grant funding. And then back down to the recommendations – to touch on what Dale said –

Chair Lohman: Opportunities – grant funding opportunities.

Mr. Adams: Yeah, at least recreational grant funding monies – parks and recreational grant funding monies. If there's a habitat component it may, but I'm fine with parks and recreational.

Mr. Easton: And then back down to recommendations: How about if the Commission – number 6 – recommends – the Planning Commission recommends that the Parks Department and Parks Board reconstitute chapter 5, present it to be docketed in the – 2014?

Mr. Pernula: 13.

Mr. Easton: – the 2013 – aren't we on the 2013s now? Or are we on the 2012s? Okay, so to be docketed in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan Amendments next calendar year – or cycle.

Chair Lohman: Okay. Any other recommendations or findings?

Mr. Axthelm: We are adding –

Mr. Easton: You want to do one with habitat? Did you want to use an example of habitat?

Mr. Axthelm: Yeah, yeah, an example to me. Is it emphasizing – as another one, yeah – emphasis to be placed on habitat and on wildlife conservation.

Mr. Greenwood: As opposed to...

Mr. Axthelm: Yeah, yeah – that more emphasis needs to be on public use of those lands and – how do you put it? – where people and wildlife are using those lands together so that we can enjoy the public lands.

Chair Lohman: Did he capture it?

Mr. Axthelm: This is as opposed to keeping it totally separate because if you have public lands and you can't get in and enjoy those lands, then there's an issue, as far as I'm concerned, with Parks and Recreation. Obviously if it's a wildlife conservation area that's a different story. That's – I understand that.

Mr. Greenwood: Maybe a comment after conservation and then just go into more emphasis needs to – does that make sense? – as opposed to remove that portion?

Mr. Axthelm: Yeah.

Chair Lohman: I think the third – item C – would be to remove opinion and typos.

Mr. Axthelm: One more thing. You were talking about the state and how it had emphasized state and how it had emphasized federal. Maybe what needs to be – now I understand state and federal mandates some of the things that we do in our county, but I think the emphasis needs to be placed more on, What are our *county's* goals?

Mr. Greenwood: ____ goals of this document to reflect county goals as they coincide with state objectives.

Mr. Axthelm: Yeah.

Mr. Temples: Oh, that's good.

Mr. Axthelm: I would add one more comment. I would say “better” – “should better reflect.” Because it does. It reflects a lot of county goals in there. It's just a matter of emphasizing that better. Does that work?

Mr. Greenwood: Yes. I like it.

Chair Lohman: Anything else from the people that haven't spoken?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Okay, are you ready to move on?

Mr. Adams: Just for the record and because I've got Parks folks here, I do want to emphasize the fact that there are many chapters in this document that talk about recreation. We believe in recreation. I just don't want you to focus so much on chapter 5 that you don't feel that we don't have a balance, because I really feel that we talk about all those uses in the field. I strongly believe in recreation. I agree with Keith that we need to get people out there. They become our biggest advocates of the parks. So I just don't want that to be lost. We are extremely interested in recreational opportunities and we've got a great rec program with a lot of recreational activities, and we like people in our parks.

Mr. Axthelm: Thank you. And I personally am not fighting against that. I really appreciate – I mean, I've seen other counties. I've lived in Idaho and different places, and Skagit County does definitely have a lot of places that are open and I appreciate that.

Chair Lohman: Okay? Are you ready to move on to Bayview Ridge?

Mr. Easton: C-4. What are we doing with NC-1?

Chair Lohman: Anacortes?

Mr. Pernula: I believe it's reflected in the recorded motion. In the recorded motion on page 4 it says, "Proposal NC-1 was not released for public comment nor presented to the Planning Commission, so the Planning Commission makes no recommendation on its adoption, and NC-1 is mentioned here only for completeness."

Mr. Easton: Completeness in the sense that they applied – they had started it and then the process stopped?

Mr. Pernula: Completeness in dealing with all the issues that were docketed. We haven't heard from the City of Anacortes officially yet whether they want to withdraw their application or if they want to carry it on to next year, but there's no way we can take care of it this year. We need some additional information.

Mr. Easton: So that just helps us deal with that from a – in an official way?

Mr. Pernula: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Okay.

Chair Lohman: Is that because it was in the original petition back in April?

Mr. Pernula: Yes, it was on the original docket.

Chair Lohman: Back in April, right?

Mr. Pernula: Yes.

Chair Lohman: Okay.

Mr. Pernula: It was later than April.

Chair Lohman: I know but the public comments were all around April – before this batch. Okay.

Mr. Easton: Have you had any communication with them about when they – the last thing you had told us was that they had communicated to you that it would be post-election. So we're still waiting? That's the last thing we heard from them?

Mr. Pernula: That's the last thing that I have heard from them officially.

Mr. Easton: Okay. Thanks.

Chair Lohman: Okay, Bayview Ridge.

Mr. Pernula: Bayview Ridge? Once again you have a supplemental staff report as well as a draft recorded motion dealing with the matter. And remember what primarily this is dealing with are a few things. One is adding 110 acres of additional industrial land. There are some new policies that would allow changing the size of the Community Center. We're expanding the Light Industrial zone under certain conditions. Moving the Community Center to both sides of Peterson Road. There are updates in the Capital Facilities chapter to reflect current plans and conditions, and there were some other miscellaneous changes, but primarily, more than anything it's the addition of 110 acres of industrial zoning.

Chair Lohman: Nobody wants to touch it?

Mr. Easton: Do you want a motion for discussion now?

Chair Lohman: Yes.

Mr. Easton: We might as well hit for the _____. I move that we accept the proposal to amend the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan as presented.

Mr. Meenaghan: I'll second that.

Chair Lohman: Okay, it's been moved and seconded to accept the proposal to amend the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan as presented.

Mr. Easton: I want to recall a witness – a member of the public. Roger?

Mr. Hughes: _____ question ___?

Chair Lohman: Yes.

Mr. Hughes: By voting no on this, that puts that 110 acres back into residential?

Mr. Easton: It *leaves* it in residential. You might like to tell us who you are.

Roger Howard: My name's Roger Howard. I live in Burlington. I am the President of the Burlington-Edison School Board.

Mr. Easton: Roger, for clarification, originally it was the plan to – the County's plan was to take the PUD and the Subarea Plan update together, but for reasons that were outside of a lot of our controls that got split apart. So a lot of the questions that I've had about what's going on with the District were in light of

thinking these two proposals were going to come together. So as I was reviewing my notes and preparing for tonight, I have a couple of questions to just clarify where the District's at. For the sake of discussion, I want to assume that the PUD never materializes because I can't vote today assuming that it's going to pass. I mean, I have to vote today on the proposal that's in front of me. So the questions I have are in that light.

If no other regulations were to change, how does the District feel about whether they'll need to site a school in Bayview if there were no additional – because the PUD would bring additional density. I had gotten answers to that question with that in mind, so my question is: What's the School Board's position – as the residential lies today as in relationship to this document, which would take 110 acres of that out of residential, so your need for less homes on the hill if this passes only, how's that affect the District and its planning? That may be a little confusing.

Mr. Howard: Yeah!

Mr. Easton: So basically your conditions right now when we're about to take 110 – potentially take 110 acres – out of residential.

Mr. Howard: Correct.

Mr. Easton: Do you still need a school up there if you never get a PUD? I could have just said that the first time!

Mr. Howard: What you're asking is if the residential development never occurred – the Bayview Ridge development?

Mr. Easton: Yeah. If you have the current conditions that are at Bayview and then you take out 110 which could have been residential now – because that's what we're considering – so you take current today Bayview, you take out 110 acres, do you still believe you need a school there?

Mr. Howard: No.

Mr. Easton: Okay. And you testified that the District supports the idea of the 110 acres being moved to Light Industrial.

Mr. Howard: That's correct.

Mr. Easton: Okay. Thanks. That's all I have. Dale?

Mr. Pernula: I think there might be a little bit of a misunderstanding. I think your question was removal of the industrial area yet development of the rest of the Planned Unit Development in residential –

Mr. Howard: Oh, yeah, if that –

Mr. Easton: No, no – no.

Mr. Howard: If that occurred, we certainly do need a school.

Mr. Easton: Right. What I'm – I want to –

Mr. Pernula: I want to make it clear whether or not it meant there would be some additional residential development or not.

Mr. Easton: I have to today – we have to today deliberate with the assumption that the PUD never gets passed.

Chair Lohman: But the –

Mr. Easton: Potentially, I mean, I mean I think that's one of the things I have to consider when I'm ruling.

Chair Lohman: But the Plan calls for 5600 people with or without the PUD.

Mr. Easton: And that's the question that I have for the District.

Mr. Howard: What was that? I didn't hear what she said.

Mr. Easton: The Plan calls for 5600 people with or without the PUD. It's just the matter of density, which either may or may not increase the amount. So does the District believe that if the Bayview Plan, as it's written today, as it's in law today, minus the 110 acres that we're about to take out, do you still – do you need a school?

Mr. Howard: Yes, we do need a school.

Mr. Easton: Okay. So that helps. That clarifies that to me. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Easton: Thanks, Dale.

(inaudible comments from several Commissioners)

Mr. Easton: Do you have a question for him?

Chair Lohman: Anybody else have any questions for the School District?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Well –

Mr. Easton: I have one more for the District. I think this is probably – I don't know if Roger wants to take it or – Roger, do you want to take this one or I don't know if you want to have Laurel take it? It's going to be about Zone 6.

Chair Lohman: Maybe ask the question and whoever can –

Mr. Easton: Okay. Where are we at in the process of siting – finding a site in the school district – with the District and the County? After the conversation or the discussion that the Port brought forward concerning the lines – the new lines that have been proposed – where's the process at in finding and siting a potential school site?

Mr. Howard: We've been working very closely with the County Planning Department and the County Commissioners office and the County GIS Department on suitable sites near the development area for a school. We've met with them and we have found two sites that have potential, but there are significant challenges with those two sites. We plan on meeting with the County Planning Department and the Commissioners tomorrow to review those issues and to review what other options are available to the District as it pertains to this development.

Mr. Easton: We're not the only area that's ever dealt with this type of issue before. Is it normal that the District – I mean, is it normal for the District to run in the lead position when helping to site these things or is it normal for you to work side by side with the County as the overall land use party that's responding to the government entity that's responsible? I mean, how's this partnership work and why are we back here again talking about school siting, which we've been talking about for ten or fifteen years?

Mr. Howard: I think that the thing that has changed is the Department of Transportation's Aviation Division's guidelines on siting a school in the development area. We had worked with the County and the property owners and the Port on siting a school, and prior to the District and the County discovering that the DOT's Aviation Division's guidelines had changed from the 1999 to the 2011 guidelines, we had found a site. We found two potential sites and the County was going to zone those areas that would allow a school to be built there. With the discovery of the new guidelines from the DOT's Aviation Division that does not recommend placing a K through – or a K through 12 school in *any* of the zones, 1 through 6, that pretty much eliminated our ability to find a suitable site within the development area. So that pushed us outside the boundaries of Zone 6. We aren't allowed to build a school in *any* of the zones, 1 through 6. So that pushed the available properties for a suitable school outside the

development area. That limited our ability to find a piece of property within the urban growth area adjacent to this development. That was our challenge and we have not been able to find a site that is within the urban growth area and has the amenities that is required to build a school. The two sites that we looked at, neither one of them has access to a sewer system for a school, which is a huge challenge. So, like I say, we haven't been able to find a site that's suitable for a school outside the airport environs, yet within the urban growth area, that would allow for a sewer and other amenities for a school system at this development area.

Mr. Easton: Is it true that – I did some research – a little bit of calling around and trying to get an understanding of where you guys were at – about how close you are to needing another elementary school – or another school, period. The information that I got – and I want to make sure that I relay this right – is that you're within maybe as few as 100, 150 children away from needing to start taking action immediately on an additional school. Are you tapped out when the effort when it comes to space and that you're – so you might take another year or two, it might take five more years for 1000 more people to move up on the hill, but if 100 more kids file for – you know, join the District, are you guys in a position where you're going to have to start looking to site a school sooner than later?

Mr. Howard: That's correct. We are tapped out. We have forty-one portables sited at all our schools, and we are not allowed to place any more portables at any of our current school locations, so we are maxed out. So this development would trigger the need for us to build another school. I mean, we essentially need a new school now because of the forty-one portables we have. But, yeah, we are maxed out.

Mr. Easton: And is Bayview – is part of the – part of the urgency about this situation, is it tied to the fact that Bayview is the highest and best place for the District to put a school? I mean, aside from the stuff we're working on, is that where you would most likely put a school?

Mr. Howard: We've looked throughout the entire Burlington School District and we have challenges with the floodplain, with urban growth areas, wetlands – I mean, our county, we're not unique in that respect as far as our school district, but we have many challenges to find a suitable site that is within the urban growth area that has sewer available to it, stormwater drainage available to it, and is not within wetlands or the floodplain or those type of issues. So we have some big challenges.

Now the County Planning Department, we've been working very closely and diligently with the County in trying to help us site a site *anywhere* in our Burlington School District, not just at the Bayview development, and that has been a huge challenge for us. We currently have three properties that the

School District has acquired over time, even way back in the '60s, that two of those sites are not available to build a school. One of the sites is east of Burlington. It's not presently large enough, we don't have access to adequate sewage or stormwater. So we don't really have an answer. I can't tell you today that we have a site that is available to build a school. We don't have one. And that's why the development at Bayview Ridge, prior to the discovery of the DOT's Aviation Guidelines 2011 that precluded us from building within Zone 6, we felt we were fortunate to find a couple of sites at that area. But we can't now because of those regulations.

Mr. Easton: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Lohman: Thank you. You again, Jason.

Mr. Easton: I want to recall Patsy and the Port.

Chair Lohman: Please.

Mr. Easton: Please. Can you can tell us who you are and –

Patsy Martin: Sure. I'm Patsy Martin, Executive Director for the Port of Skagit.

Mr. Easton: So, Patsy, the number one concern, or probably one of the biggest concerns that has come forward through the public testimony, public written comment, and just the general concern that you're having around the airport for me, and Bayview, is infrastructure and particularly transportation infrastructure.

Ms. Martin: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Supporting an additional – you testified that the Port supports the additional 110 transferring from Residential to – moving from the Residential side of the world over to the Light Industrial side of the world.

Ms. Martin: I don't believe I did testify to that last time but we do support that.

Mr. Easton: Okay, so all right great. Sorry for assuming that. With that in mind, does the Port feel like there are adequate solutions in place to help deal with that different type of traffic? Because, clearly, 110 acres of Residential creates a different type of traffic pattern than 110 acres of Light Industrial.

Ms. Martin: The Higgins Airport Way road section is in good shape. Highway 20's in good shape. Josh Wilson Road is not and that needs a lot of work and I know that the Public Works Department sent an announcement to that, that that needs to be improved. And Peterson Road also needs improvements to get from that 110 acres over to Higgins Airport Way.

Mr. Easton: Another issue that came up – somebody was concerned about rail traffic, particularly on the spur out to Anacortes that's significantly – I mean, it's already significantly increased. There's a proposal to – at least my eye test – I live out there – my eye test is I pass more trains than I used to pass that are running that spur.

Ms. Martin: Yes. Yes. There are some –

Mr. Easton: Because of the changes that happened with Tesoro, and now the proposal was shelved –

Ms. Martin: ____, mm-hmm.

Mr. Easton: Does the Port have any concerns about how that intersection is working with – working in with the addition of 110 acres make that more of a challenge?

Ms. Martin: I don't see that as more of a challenge. I understand that Tesoro has more rail cars going in. I understand Shell's got more proposals there as well. That's industrial development that we think is good for the county and good jobs, so we support that. We are not finding that our tenants are adversely impacted by what's happening now, and we look to continue to work with the railroad and those users – to make sure that everybody can use those systems.

Mr. Easton: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Nakis: I have a question.

Ms. Martin: Sure.

Ms. Nakis: How much inventory does the Port currently have right now just sitting idle?

Ms. Martin: We don't currently right now have any buildings that are vacant – I would put it that way. We have some vacant land but it's needing development. I mean, it's needing to be logged, it's needing to be cleared and soils put in place. It needs some work to get it to where it's ready to develop. Some of it's – a lot of it's platted and ready to go from that perspective, and I would say there's – rough numbers – a couple hundred acres. And we're currently doing an industrial land inventory for the whole county – working with all of our partners, including Skagit County – to better understand exactly what that means. So we know what we have but we don't know what everybody else has, so now we're going to come up with a GIS database to show that.

Mr. Easton: Is there an estimate of when that land study will be done?

Ms. Martin: Mm-hmm. The first preliminary numbers will be out in December and then we're waiting for the jobs inventory that Skagit Council of Governments is working on to be merged with that, because there are different population and job projections now, so merging with that. So after the first of the year we think that the whole thing will be completed.

Mr. Easton: So, in general, it's the Port's position – is it the Port's position that Light Industrial is the best neighbor to the airport when it comes to zoning?

Ms. Martin: Industrial use is a very good neighbor to the airport. We like industrial uses – that is definitely true. I would say that, to go back in history, we spent a lot of time in the '90s and the early 2000s trying to have an overall compatible use, and we worked with Skagit County landowners, we worked with the City of Burlington, we worked with the school, and we felt that the previous plan was a good, compatible use with the airport.

Mr. Easton: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Martin: Okay.

Mr. Greenwood: Are we not just looking to address these minor changes to the Subarea Plan at this time?

Chair Lohman: I don't think they're minor.

Mr. Greenwood: Well, switching from 110 acres – to 110 acres of Light Industrial instead of Residential, right? We're not talking about compatibility issues –

Mr. Easton: Well, to me that's a question that totally fits this.

Mr. Greenwood: The PUD's what's holding everything up when going forward, as far as development goes, right?

Mr. Easton: So I'm taking the stance in my deliberations that the PUD doesn't exist, because – based especially on the history of this area –

Mr. Greenwood: And therefore residential development cannot continue.

Mr. Easton: Residential development *can* continue. It can continue at the level of zoning that's currently there.

Chair Lohman: But there's a – there's quite a few strikeouts and additions.

Mr. Greenwood: Right. I see that, too. You're right.

Chair Lohman: And a lot of them I feel really are too much detail. They should probably belong in the PUD or in the zoning code. That rather than staying in an umbrella-type plan maybe at the 10,000-foot level or – it dips down into the details of zoning code, and I think it needs to not be so specific. And specifically it's chapter 2, page 7 – chapter 2, page 7. There's a lot of reference, and mostly it's related to the Residential elements and Community Center-type elements –

Mr. Easton: Oh, can you pull that?

Chair Lohman: – that I'm having trouble with.

Mr. Easton: Oh, you're going to be able to pull that up for us?

Mr. Christensen: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: Oh, great – then I don't have to try to find it.

Chair Lohman: I mean, it's getting into this – a lot of detail about community design and stuff like that and I'm just struggling with that kind of detail in a subarea plan. Is that appropriate for a subarea plan? I guess is my question.

Mr. Easton: So we're looking at chapter 2, your example in chapter 2?

Chair Lohman: Yeah, and there's a lot of new language and strikeouts from the old Plan. And some of it I recognize as being from the PUD plan.

Mr. Johnson: So is there a specific spot?

Mr. Hughes: It's on page 22.

Mr. Easton: It's 2-7.

Chair Lohman: The page numbering in this document is really hard to use and I'm just going to say it out loud. I mean, you get into the details like Building Design where you talk about architecture, character and scale, and I think that's way too specific for a subarea plan. Dale?

Mr. Pernula: I think I agree with you that it'd be nicer to have a higher level look at a more general. And maybe the formatting's difficult to deal with at times, but remember this is an existing adopted plan that we're amending.

Chair Lohman: Right.

Mr. Pernula: And we're following largely the same format that it's already in. There may be some details that were added beyond where they should have been but, for the most part, it's amending existing, highly detailed text.

Chair Lohman: But I'm referring to the new language.

Mr. Pernula: I – yeah, I understand. There are some –

Chair Lohman: And so that's up for grabs now, correct? That's what we're working on?

Mr. Easton: Correct.

Mr. Pernula: Yes.

Chair Lohman: And that includes where – the reference in the Community Center where – which is chapter 4, and this would be to have the – straddle Peterson Road, and I have a problem with that. The inserted language is “on both sides of Peterson Road,” and I'm worried about creating a choke point on Peterson Road because Peterson Road is a main arterial. It's a main truck route now. I realize the conflict that there's residential, but we don't have really a better way – a better road – especially when you want to go to the north of the ridge. And I have driven up there, I have looked at the maps, I've studied it. I'm not sure that the pro – on paper the proposed north-south connector from Peterson over to Josh Wilson looks like a great idea, on paper where you're looking at a flat diagram. But when you look at it in real life, it's at the bottom of the hill on Josh Wilson which is a 50-mile-an-hour road, and it's creating an additional T intersection. I'm concerned about that. And I sat there for quite a while this week-end looking at that prior to this meeting because I'm worried about that. At the end of that T you come off of the proposed idea at the bottom of Jensen Lane and there's Joe Leary Slough, and I'm concerned that that's not the panacea road it looks like in the pretty pictures. And that's an addition. So for those reasons I would recommend that those be stricken from the proposal.

Mr. Johnson: So you could recommend, as you've done on the CFP and the previous issue, that the Planning Commission if you are – most of the speakers were – in support of the 110 acres, we support the change of 110 acres and the other miscellaneous things, but we have reservations about the following issues and would like to see those further addressed.

Mr. Easton: Well, there's a significant difference between “reservations” and a potential amendment for us to make a recommendation that doesn't include this section at all. So, I mean, I'm not sure – we can talk about either one of their options because they're both options in front of us, but the tone I was understanding that you were taking, Annie, was more about maybe in the direction of an amendment to strike that section in general and to see whether the rest of your Commission has the support.

Chair Lohman: Or strike the change.

Mr. Easton: Strike the change – and leave it as it is?

Chair Lohman: Well –

Mr. Easton: Well, I mean, if you did that in the form of an amendment, well, obviously we'd have to have some discussion. There'd be some discussion about it. But I think Kirk's right. We can approve parts of this. It's not up or down.

Chair Lohman: This Plan is – you know, you've got – what is it? – nine chapters or ten chapters – however many chapters, and there's added language almost throughout, but not 100%. I mean, some chapters got quite a bit of added language – chapter 2 got quite a bit and the Community Center got a lot, but others didn't. And so maybe what we need to do is look at the chapters.

Mr. Johnson: Okay, it – if I may speak, Dale? The situation facing the County is, I think it's very safe to say, that the Commissioners support the change of the 110 additional Industrial acres. We are toward the end of the year. We have one opportunity to amend the Comprehensive Plan. And so there is kind of a time limit here if the County is going to be able to adopt those changes to the map that accomplished the 110 acres. So I'm not sure the Department would recommend you spending the next six weeks amending the Subarea Plan, but if there are specific issues – you know, it's too wordy in these places; we have concerns about this road; that sort of thing – that's one way to go about it. I think our concern is that if you go much beyond an additional meeting beyond this then if your recommendation goes to the County Commissioners and there's a significant change there they want to take public comment but they won't have the time to do that and adopt the Plan before the end of the year. So I'm not trying to say, you know, your hands are tied and the like, but –

Chair Lohman: Dave?

Mr. Hughes: You know, this Community Center thing that's part of this application I read as, you know, moving it down in acres. Why couldn't we agree to that part but as far as the location of it that would be taken up at the time when, if there's a PUD ordinance addressed, that's when we take up where actually this Community Center acreage would be? But agree to reduce the acres of it as proposed; the location to be determined later.

Chair Lohman: It may not be we want it on Peterson Road.

Mr. Hughes: Well, it might not – yeah. Did it say right now to rezone something to Community Center when we don't have a development plan is putting the cat before the cow or something. I don't know.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah, so as the Department response to the comments said, it's the Department's recommendation if you could – a lot of the issues could be deferred until the PUD ordinance is moving forward. So, I mean, I don't want to speak for Dale but you're certainly welcome to make recommendations that we're comfortable with the Community Center being downsized but we have some reservations about the location and we think that needs more attention.

Mr. Easton: So who instigated the conversation about the issues around the Community Center? Was that County-initiated, landowner-initiated or someone else?

Mr. Johnson: I don't have the history with the Plan to really be able to answer that.

Mr. Easton: Mr. Sitkin. I'd like to recall Mr. Sitkin.

Mr. Hughes: I think that when the school couldn't build there that they ____ – and that was the whole part of the Community Center anyways.

Mr. Easton: I just want to get a clearer picture of this. So give me a – Mr. Sitkin, can you give us your name and who you represent and then we'll go from there?

Jon Sitkin: Jon Sitkin, representing the Bouslog family and properties, one of the property owners that are affected by this. The history of the size of the Community Center. It was at – I recall – it was one point smaller. It was enlarged when the County was looking to have a 25-acre – one single 25-acre park located at Bayview Ridge. So it was decided to include 40 acres so that it could include a 25-acre park. So with the update of the Plan – and it's too bad the Parks Director left again – but in extensive meetings with the Parks Department, they said, We don't need, we don't want to maintain a large 25-acre park. We'd rather have smaller parks throughout the residential development. We said, Fine – shrank the size of the Community Center as a result. The other aspect of it, when you get to the size of the Community Center commercial property, if it's fronting a road the acreage became so deep you had a lot of areas behind the first few hundred feet. It would be rather dead zone, we felt, from a commercial perspective because you weren't on the _ streets. Or at the time the school was considering locating adjacent to that and would you want the Community Center and a dead commercial zone next to a school? It seemed more – that amount of acreage to serve the commercial – neighborhood-type commercial needs for that area, industrial and residential areas – consisting of those – that amount of acreage wasn't necessary. It was felt it would be a smaller acreage – I think we came up with 7 – and then the utility of a commercial operation it would be more effective on both sides than on one side, for some of the reasons I explained before.

Do you want to defer – I'm just – I haven't talked with John, I haven't talked – we try to collaborate with the County on everything. I haven't spoken to them. My gut reaction is deferring the relocation of the Community Center isn't a concern to us. Downsizing, I think, would be a key thing to do.

Mr. Easton: So make the case to me why downsizing needs to be done now as opposed to in a PUD.

Mr. Sitkin: To have an efficient industrial layout.

Mr. Easton: Okay. So in relationship to its layout as it sits. So – I have one more question – so the additional 110 acres potentially that's moved over to Light Industrial: Do you and the folks you represent have any concerns about the current transportation – there were a lot of comments that were made and I want to revisit those because so many people made them about transportation in that area – as someone who would – a group that would primarily benefit from the 110 acres going to Light Industrial?

Mr. Sitkin: No, we're not concerned about it. I think, you know, you view transportation planning anticipating rail system operating at capacity. You know, you don't assume 100 capacity. You plan for systems operating at or near capacity and the rail is the system that should be considered to be operating at or near capacity. I think Patsy's comment that addressing the industrial _____. There's a stretch of road that has to be – to have some improvement. Josh Wilson, questions remain. What ____ the north-south, where _____. Those are things to be addressed in the development process.

Mr. Easton: Okay.

Chair Lohman: I also have problems with the density bonus, and I'm questioning, Why do you need a density bonus? Because you're writing the Plan, you get to set the density where you want it. You have a clean slate, in a way, because you've got the PUD and the Subarea Plan here. It isn't like it's – like the horse has left the barn and you're having to repair something. So why do we need that? And I have to agree with the comments that were made at the public hearing about linking it to the Farmland Legacy Program when that linkage really isn't correct and there isn't that type of vehicle as played out as suggested in the Plan. I think it's not right and I would like to just strike it from the Plan.

Mr. Pernula: If I remember correctly, there's two types of density bonuses. One deals with, perhaps, farmland; the other one deals with certain amenities that they would like to see up there.

Chair Lohman: It's actually referenced more than one – in more than one place. It's referenced on chapter 2, page 3 – 2 dash 3 – at the very bottom of the first

column and the top of the second column, and then I saw it in a little more detail – more elaborate reference to it – I didn't write down where I saw it, but I saw it.

Mr. Johnson: So I think there're three things that can be achieved through the density bonus. One is protection of farmland, with the way that it's written currently. Another is the building that's proposed achieves LEED certification, and the third is affordable housing – that if a certain amount of the housing that's proposed as a development it meets a certain standard of affordability that the units of bonus density are offered. Why would you do that? It's a fairly commonly used planning tool in more urbanized communities where there's demand for development. Sure, you could say you can have six units per acre outright, but if you have an incentive zoning situation in place you can say outright, You get four and if you want to go higher that the jurisdiction would like something in return for that. And so what's offered in return for the ability to go to the two units of additional density is affordable housing, LEED certification, or the farmland protection or the land conservation. It has to be structured in a way where it's an economic incentive for the developer or they're not going to do it. So if you price the density bonus at exactly what they're able to make through the additional development and there's no profit, there's no financial incentive; therefore, then they're not going to do it. So it's a way to try to use private market incentives to achieve a goal that you're comfortable with, which would be the six units per acre – if that's, you know, the adopted policy – but also achieve some other things as well. Sometimes incentive zoning is done for open space within a community and sometimes it's done for conservation outside of a community. The reason it's, I think, tied to Farmland Legacy – and this has been in place for, I don't know, five years or so – goes back to, I believe, Burlington setting up its Burlington Agricultural Heritage Density Credit Program where developers can purchase additional units of density in their downtown and in their residential zones, and if those purchases are made then the revenues that are generated are given to the Farmland Legacy Program, which then uses them as match funds for purchasing Ag-NRL development rights. So I guess it wouldn't need to be linked to the Farmland Legacy Program. The County Commissioners thought that when they adopted the Subarea Plan apparently they thought that was a good nexus, an additional way using private market incentives to help achieve farmland conservation.

Mr. Temples: Kirk, I think you've partially answered my first question, but I was trying to – as you were describing this I was wondering, Are there other places – in other words, is there a history in this county of this being a process that's used? And, if so, where's it being done? Or is it a recent thing?

Mr. Johnson: Yeah. So Burlington has a program. I think it's only sold two development credits up until this point. It was put in place in 2009 as the housing market was tanking so I don't think there was a whole lot of any kind of development in Burlington. Without getting too specific, there is a project that – a potential project in Burlington – that would purchase additional density credits.

So I think Margaret Fleek has said that the City feels that when the economy and the housing market pick up that the use of density credits will expand as well.

Mount Vernon has had a TDR program that was successful or was working for a number of years and did result in some transfers of development rights off of agricultural land that's within their city limits. Their City Council had some concerns about the type of development essentially that was being achieved with the additional units of density, and so they've made some changes to that so that it's really not functioning anymore.

Mr. Easton: Can we pull a map up that shows this area that's being moved around – these shift – this includes a shift of 49 acres to BR-LI and then the 7 acres to BR-CC – so we have a point of reference?

Mr. Johnson: Sure. So I guess taking a step back – I mean, what the supplemental – what the Department staff report said is that there are a lot of issues that come to the fore, or will come to the fore, when the PUD ordinance is moving forward, and it may be untimely really to dive into the two units of density bonus because it's simply not an opportunity that's available to a developer until the PUD ordinance is put in place.

Mr. Easton: Wait a second.

Chair Lohman: But it's in the proposed Subarea Plan.

Mr. Easton: Wait a second. You just said three things that contradict themselves, I think.

Mr. Johnson: Okay.

Mr. Easton: One, it *is* – it's in front of us right now as a draft, that if we pass the motion that's on the table, it would sail through. Two, you can't use it until – it's here but you can't use it until the PUD passes?

Mr. Johnson: Right.

Mr. Easton: So – so why is it here then if it's – why did we put it in now if it's tied directly to the PUD?

Mr. Johnson: Dale?

Mr. Pernula: I think it opens up the opportunity to put it in your PUD code when it comes up.

Mr. Easton: Ah, so you had one before the other?

Mr. Pernula: Right. And right now the moratorium is on development with more than four lots – so it's any subdivision beyond four lots there's a moratorium on it right now.

Mr. Easton: So in the period of time between the approval of this – potentially the approval of these amendments and the PUD, the moratorium would end and you could develop and you couldn't use this density bonus though.

Mr. Pernula: Not until the PUD ordinance is adopted.

Mr. Easton: What happens if the PUD ordinance is never adopted? This never gets used then. This density bonus would become invalid. That's really important because people think we're not making a – people think, because we've said over and over again or a number of us have said – we're not making a residential decision tonight.

Chair Lohman: But we are.

Mr. Easton: But it sure kind of sounds like we're setting one up in the future, so I'm trying to understand: Are we making a residential decision?

Mr. Pernula: No, it's already zoned Residential.

Mr. Easton: So we're not adding anything additional to that Residential.

Mr. Pernula: You're not. No.

Mr. Easton: So there –

Mr. Pernula: You're opening up the opportunity for having this density bonus.

Mr. Easton: So if the PUD never passes we never change the amount of people who could live on the hill. We pass everything that's –

Mr. Pernula: There could be some development, but there's a limit of four lots.

Mr. Easton: Four lots per acre that's currently there.

Mr. Pernula: No, four lots per parcel.

Mr. Easton: Four lots per parcel. Which is different than what we're in right now?

Mr. Pernula: (inaudible)

Chair Lohman: How big?

Mr. Easton: Right?

Chair Lohman: Four lots per acre, right?

Mr. Pernula: No, not per acre.

Chair Lohman: Per parcel?

Mr. Pernula: Any subdivision with more than four lots would not be permitted.

Mr. Easton: So I'd like to ask Mr. Sitkin a question. He's so clairvoyant he's already walking towards the mic.

Mr. Sitkin: So there exists in your code today –

Mr. Easton: Boy, you jumped before the question!

Mr. Sitkin: Well, I was anticipating the question having heard the discussion – I think trying to just link what you two are saying. In your existing code today, there's a limitation that says until a PUD ordinance is adopted you cannot do five or more lots – new residential lots – whether you have a 4-acre existing parcel or a hundred-acre parcel, your subdivision can't occur for more than four, so that – until a PUD ordinance is adopted. So until you go through a text amendment and change that, it's referred to as a moratorium, but technically – as a lawyer – I wouldn't say that's a moratorium. Its *effect* is a moratorium. So this density bonus is there that was called for in the existing Plan. The sequence of how it would work is set forth in the PUD ordinance, but to marry the technical aspects of how that PUD is going to occur with the language of the Subarea Plan that was existing and language of the Subarea Plan had to be tweaked. But it always has contemplated a density bonus to go from four up to six based upon the notion of moving densities out of farmland to the hill, on the ridge. When it came to implementing, it was – we said, Okay, use the Farmland Legacy Program. ___ doesn't have one yet. We said, Well, then don't hang the process up without having a program to implement, so that's why you had the stepped tiers. You go to five, you go to six. Let's use affordable housing and environmental incentives – the LEED program – and we'd layer it like that. You'd see that in the PUD in more detail. But this was more of an evolution from the original Subarea Plan trying to marry what was in the implementation ordinance.

Mr. Easton: So the Director just said – so thank you for answering that question – but the Director just said that if approved as presented to us tonight there could be an increase in the amount of residential development on the hill?

Mr. Sitkin: I think you guys were speaking – trying to speak the same thing but in different ways. You can't have the zoning at six. That's what the Director said.

You can't – if this passes tonight, you'd actually have a reduction in density because you're taking away industrial for – residential land for industrial. Like schematically you would not have a change in the allowable densities because that limitation in 14.16.340(5) – see, look at this.

Mr. Greenwood: It's more like a choke chain, not a moratorium. It could be loosened, right?

Mr. Sitkin: And this proposal doesn't loosen it. The Subarea Plan doesn't loosen it.

Mr. Greenwood: But it sets it up for it.

Mr. Sitkin: Just as the current Subarea Plan.

Mr. Easton: I just really want to make sure that we're voting on apples and not oranges when it comes to this because we've made a lot of comments to the public that we are not increasing – this is not a proposal about residential. It's actually about reducing residential. And I just want to make sure the technicalities are not going to find me wrong on this later.

Mr. Sitkin: Let me put it this way. If the Commissioners acted – if you pass favorably and the Commission passed this tomorrow, Thursday I could not come in with a plat application, except for four units or less which are already the rules. So when the Director says the zoning's there and the densities won't increase, and you're saying, Will the densities increase, and the answer is no.

Mr. Easton: Okay.

Chair Lohman: Question for Kirk: Additional language added is “suburban,” and it's in 5-2.

Mr. Johnson: Okay, let's see.

Chair Lohman: Chapter 5 is the Housing chapter, and on the top of 5-2. Okay, “suburban” is the first additional. What is the definition of “suburban”? What's a suburban density?

Mr. Johnson: Well, urban is generally under GMA – although not totally fixed – considered four units per acre or greater. I think there's some three-unit-per-acre residential development up there. I think there's some two-unit-per-acre residential development. I think there's some one residence per 5-acre development. So I would say that the gap between one per 10, which is Rural Reserve or – well, now we're starting to split hairs. I mean, the County has Rural Intermediate and Rural Village zones which are 1-acre lots, 2 ½-acre lots, but they were there ____, you know, a certain period of time. I'd say the range

between one per 10 and four units per acre is suburban. It's probably what that's referring to.

Chair Lohman: Do you have it defined somewhere?

Mr. Johnson: I don't know.

Mr. Greenwood: Somebody inserted it for a reason, right?

Chair Lohman: Right.

Mr. Greenwood: Because you had urban and rural residential.

Mr. Johnson: Well, like I said, I would define it as the things in between one per 10, which fits to a County rural zone where you can subdivide down to 10, and four units per acre, which is clearly urban. I would say that would, from a planning perspective, be considered kind of this suburban range. And maybe it was just acknowledging that there is some development – there're 5-acre lots. As I understand it, there's some 2-acre lots. It's hard to call 2-acre lots urban and it's also hard to call them rural under what's generally accepted as GMA definitions of rural.

Mr. Temples: It's almost like black and white and you inserted gray.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah.

Mr. Greenwood: I'm just – it's not good to say "I feel," but I'm going to say it anyway! I feel as though we got on a horse many years ago and we had some information that said we need a subarea plan to accommodate our Growth Management Act requirements, and we looked to a place like Bayview Ridge and said, This looks like a good place to do it, and we're afraid to get off. And I think that there's been some information that has changed the scenario. We've had some change in management with regard to the airport. We've had some changes in our industrial climate, both heavy and light. We've had some changes in the usage of the rail. So there's been changes to that friction point between compatible uses and incompatible uses, and residential is not necessarily very compatible with some industrial activities including rail traffic, including air traffic. If there's changes that take place to those – yeah, transportation, I think. You know, maybe the school thing was an easier problem to solve before, but I think it's become more difficult. An expansion of the runway – that's a huge thing. Maybe changes in the aerospace industry and the types of planes we use. Maybe we need better mufflers. Bu, you know, when you change a type of airplane at an airstrip, well, suddenly all those people who are there maybe in 1995 were okay with a little prop duster at first but now they're not going to be happy with the situation. So we decided residential would be good, we can add more there. If we put more in there we're introducing more of an

opportunity for conflict and I just think that whether we deal with it in just the details – we just handle it when we get to the PUD – or revisit the adequacy or the goals of the Subarea Plan and its adequacy for dealing with compatibility, we've got to deal with it sometime. And I see a conflict building and I think it's building pretty quickly.

Mr. Easton: You might want to block out a good chunk of time for when the PUD ordinance comes before us.

Chair Lohman: I can't help but think we don't get a do-over. And we've got a gem in this county and that's the airport and all of the potential benefits that it has in the future, but the stuff that it's doing for us now. And we've been told over and over and over again – and we have a poster child of poor airport planning in this same county – so we have this jewel and I'm worried that some of this – what is proposed tonight – I don't object to the 110 acres switching over to Light Industrial, but some of the other new language in some of the – maybe it's a spillover from the original plan – is not in the best interest of that.

Mr. Easton: So do you want to vote against my motion or do you want to amend it and take out a bunch of stuff that you don't like? And maybe you can get a second to do that.

Mr. Meenaghan: It's been so long – what was your motion?

Mr. Easton: It was really straightforward. It was just to approve what was presented.

Chair Lohman: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: It was basically a placeholder to start discussion.

Mr. Meenaghan: Oh, okay.

Chair Lohman: I see a lot of things like in the chapter 4 on the Community Center, to go back to that item. It assumes that it's a done deal: The Community Center's going to straddle Peterson Road or be along Peterson Road, and it refers to all the new language that's been added. It talks about Peterson Road. And I think it's a little too specific. And so that, as an example of a thing I have problems with, and part of the reason is – has to – it's correlated to the transportation. But you're also wanting to have Light Industrial in all the Port-related activities. Well, those are jobs so you've got people going to work that need a decent way to get to work and they're going to possibly be using Peterson Road, and you don't want to create a safety hazard or maybe kill commerce because you've made it so difficult to get to work. So I'm having trouble, and that's just chapter 4 – the *new* language that's in the proposal.

Mr. Meenaghan: Madame Chair?

Chair Lohman: Go ahead.

Mr. Meenaghan: Along those lines, I think the most important parts of the Subarea Plan change are listed right there in the Introduction. And it's – you know, there's four paragraphs here on page 6 of the Intro and it basically talks about the 110 acres of rezone to Light Industrial and the change of the community Center from 40 to 7. Those paragraphs describe what are the most important and central parts of this Subarea Plan. I agree with what you said there about a lot of changes, and what Pete said as well. You know, Mayor Anderson of Sedro-Woolley last week testified to the fact that, you know, he – Sedro-Woolley is willing to accept and is ready to accept more people. They have the capacity to do that with. And yet the page 5 of our Introduction here talks about – there's a sentence there that talks about the inability for Sedro-Woolley to accept more people. So I'm not sure I agree with what the premise of that Introduction says, although the four paragraphs, I think, are the most important parts to get captured.

Mr. Johnson: Commissioner Meenaghan, are you talking the Introduction to the *Plan*?

Mr. Meenaghan: Yes.

Mr. Johnson: Okay.

Chair Lohman: Where it talks about each individual city?

Mr. Meenaghan: Yep, exactly, which starts on page 4. It says, "Creating a non-municipal UGA at Bayview Ridge."

Chair Lohman: It would be really helpful in the future if we had page numbers – I mean, *real* page numbers – because I put the thing on the computer so that I could use the computer's page numbering, but it was a pain.

Mr. Easton: We'll make that a finding of fact or a recommendation. So right there on the right. Annie, can you live with just instead of changing the language to put "straddling Peterson," can you live with taking it from 40 to 7?

Chair Lohman: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Easton: And delete the rest.

Chair Lohman: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: I mean, maybe we could just – we could – here’s an idea – we could, for sake of time and sake of the potential PUD coming down the road, we could just take the four recommendations – the paragraphs that Kevin just referenced, form those into a motion; only approve those; and reject the rest of the changes – and passively reject the rest of them because we wouldn’t approve that. We would just approve only this section’s change. We’d have to proactively – then in our findings of fact recommend that the rest of those changes be reviewed during a PUD – you know, during future discussions about the area and the PUD. I mean, if they have to be a Comp Plan Amendment and not involved in the PUD, then they get back in line, I guess, next year. I haven’t heard anybody make a case for the fact that the pieces that Annie’s talking about have to be done as a Comp Plan Amendment as opposed to being addressed in the PUD. Because that’s a timing issue. Can anyone discuss that?

Chair Lohman: Can they be in the PUD?

Mr. Pernula: Could you call up specifically which ones they’re talking about?

Mr. Easton: Okay, well, let’s just take – for an example – let’s take the Community one, the Community Center. Could –

Chair Lohman: Which is the second bullet point.

Mr. Easton: Could the PUD address the location of the Community Center?

Mr. Pernula: Yes.

Chair Lohman: Because the second bullet point –

Mr. Pernula: Yes, if we write it that way. You may recall that there’s a provision in there about having a flex industrial zone where you could even have additional industrial uses through the PUD process beyond the industrial zone. So that’s just as an analogy. I don’t know why you couldn’t do the same thing with the Community Center zone.

Chair Lohman: I think you need to eliminate the specificity of *where* you want to put the Community Center.

Mr. Easton: Maybe I’ll take – let me take the question from the opposite angle. Are there parts of what’s being proposed as a Comp Plan Amendment that the only way it can change is by Comp Plan Amendment?

Mr. Pernula: For sure. The 20 acres of additional industrial land needs to be done through a Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

Mr. Easton: The 110.

Mr. Pernula: Yes.

Chair Lohman: Any rezone.

Mr. Pernula: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Okay. What other than that? Do you know?

Mr. Pernula: Well, I think that going to a lower level of specificity is good, but providing direction for where you really want to go is also good.

Mr. Easton: I don't think the nine of us are going to have any problem giving you a list of findings of fact with recommendations about what direction to go! They might not all go in the same direction, but I don't think this group will shy away from giving you those ideas!

I'm trying to drill down to what has to be done as a Comp Plan Amendment and whether we can accomplish what was testified uniformly, across the board. There's no one here that has debated the fact that the staff report reports and the Commissioners all witnessed that no one testified against bringing the 110 acres into Light Industrial. So can we just approve that, and the remainder of the things that relate to the future can be dealt with in a document? Because the truth is whether it's the Community Center or some of these other density bonus issues – some of these other things – to me that's all much more tightly tied to residential than it is to this one decision – far be it – it's an important decision – but this one decision about the 110 acres.

Mr. Johnson: So – just maybe for some context – so all of this here up until September, the Department was working under the direction to have the Subarea Plan amendments and the PUD ordinance, have the two of them consistent with the other, ready for public release and Planning Commission consideration this year. So we worked toward that goal and then sometime in early September, I think, the Commissioners said, We're going to hold up on a PUD ordinance but we're going to move the Subarea Plan forward in large measure because we want to achieve that 110 acres. So that's why there is a lot of stuff in the proposed amendments to the Subarea Plan that are very much intimately tied to the PUD ordinance, because they were moving forward as that agenda until sometime in early September. As to what that means in terms of what's in the Subarea Plan that can only be in the Subarea Plan, I'm not as quick on my feet as Ryan or others. I think clearly, like Dale said, the 110 acres is something that has to be done through the Plan. And you have to keep in mind that if you recommend not approving any other changes to the Subarea Plan, we still have a Subarea Plan. It's still talks about –

Mr. Easton: Yes.

Chair Lohman: Yes, 2008.

Mr. Johnson: – two units of density bonus in Bayview Ridge Residential with funds going to Farmland Legacy, so it's not like everything goes away. We just would go back to the Plan that's currently in place.

Mr. Easton: See, that description (is) very helpful in understanding that a number of these things that we're looking at – because we're pulling them out and looking at them individually; we're missing the other half of the reasons and the documents that help support the point of why it's there. It seems to clarify for me – I just want to vote – I mean, I'll be just simple here. I would like to vote heads up, straight up, the nine of us. You want to give them another hundred – do you want to turn 110 from Residential into Light Industrial? Because it seems like – and, boy, it doesn't happen very often when everybody agrees around here – we should take the opportunity to vote on something everybody agrees on as much as possible and move forward with what appears to be a compatible thing. All these intimate details about how this interlays with a PUD ordinance and history – the history of this project and the history in general – doesn't guarantee me that I'm ever going to see those, and if I start approving some of these changes – I don't feel like I can explain to the public that I really had a full understanding of – that just feels awkward to me.

Chair Lohman: Well, and then on the Community Center the underlying reason for the location disappeared in a way, because that was a potential school site.

Mr. Hughes: Across the street.

Chair Lohman: So when you have that kind of specificity and then it changed but you're still stuck with that spot, I'm having a problem with that.

Mr. Easton: Dale had his hand up.

Chair Lohman: Dale, sorry.

Mr. Pernula: Just on a different point: I have a bit of a concern about just pulling out some parts of it out of the Plan, because what's it going to do to the consistency of all the other elements? A lot of things that are in there, you know, you start working on one part you've got to mess around with another part of the Plan and so on, and if you just yank a part of it without taking a look at all the details there might be some problems. I don't know.

Ms. Nakis: I think when you look at the details you see more problems.

(laughter)

Mr. Pernula: I know.

Ms. Nakis: I was looking at the details of some of the dates of the information that's in here – 1996? Is there nothing more recent than 1996 – seventeen years ago – that you can draw from to get information about Anacortes or Sedro-Woolley or Mount Vernon? I mean, when the Mayor of Sedro-Woolley came in and said they've done all these updates on the sewer system and they're ready to accept more population, I mean, it's certainly not in here. What are the other Cities – what have they done over the last seventeen years that isn't reflected in this document?

Chair Lohman: Well, I think you hit a really good point, Elinor.

Mr. Greenwood: I think, too, that along the details part I know I was told to, or just instructed that wait until the PUD – let the details – they'll be taken care of when the development takes place and the PUD ordinance comes out. But when we – if you don't flesh it out to its endpoint, you don't know how it's going to work. And so even setting goals, you set a goal for something that's okay, but you've got to kind of see it – at least think it through to the end and see how it may or may not work out. I mean, we might say, It'd be great because it's out of the floodplain. Let's put the houses up there. Okay, now we feel good about that, but how are we *really* going to handle the traffic? How are we *really* going to handle the railroad? How are we *really* going to handle the conflicts with industry? Since the Bayview Ridge (Sub)area Plan was put together and adopted there's been quite a few changes in our industrial makeup in the county. And so I kind of like the statement that talks about looking at changes that have taken place in our population trends, and some of those play into why we're pushing in a certain direction or another.

Chair Lohman: Well, and are we absolutely stuck with putting 56 additional people up there?

Several Commissioners: 5600.

Chair Lohman: 5600.

Mr. Johnson: 3800 additional.

Chair Lohman: It says 5600.

Mr. Greenwood: Well, that's the total.

Chair Lohman: It's the population forecast. Are we absolutely stuck with that number? And I know a lot of people are struggling with that number. That's a lot of people.

Mr. Greenwood: And – I don't know. I frankly like getting schools out of a floodplain and I like ag land, but I'd rather stick a school in a floodplain or on ag land and give it up than stick it in a dangerous spot near an airport. If we determine that we now have different information that says it's not where you should put a school, then we shouldn't put a school there. As much as we want –

Mr. Easton: You can evacuate for a flood but you can't evacuate from an airplane.

Mr. Greenwood: I think you can run faster, you know, from running water. At least we get a report from Concrete that says it's coming, you know? When a plane goes in you don't have much time.

Mr. Easton: This is going to be my favorite part of the transcript right there.

(laughter)

Mr. Johnson: So what if you were to say that you're in support of, you know, the four things that you are in support of and you are – there's so much else there and so much of it seems to be tied to the PUD ordinance that you're just not comfortable saying you're in support of it. I mean, Dale has the idea that you start pulling a thread that you're not really sure what you're pulling and maybe a lot unravels, so maybe you go short of saying, So we want to strip everything else out, but say, This is what we're in support of and all the rest we're – you know.

Mr. Easton: It's so – here's the thing, though.

Chair Lohman: But they weren't there before.

Mr. Easton: Between the time that we make a recommendation and it goes to the Commissioners, the staff basically does a staff report on our recommendations just like you guys do, in theory, on –

Mr. Greenwood: Comments.

Mr. Easton: – public comments. And if you can make a case to the Commissioners that the way in which we pass this causes the sweater to unravel, go for it. If it's true, you'll convince two or three of them and they'll approve it regardless of our recommendations because nobody wants to pull on the string. I don't think – there's no compelling evidence right now that that's the case. I'm going to withdraw – I'm going to officially withdraw my motion for the whole document, hopefully with the agreement of the seconder, and make a different motion to deal with the issue. But if that's the case it could be dealt with. If it's not the case then everybody gets the thing we agree upon and then – we

don't want to surprise anybody. I think we're all telegraphing to some degree – those who have spoken have telegraphed, We have serious concerns as a planning commission about residential and transportation issues on the hill. We're telling you all that – all of you who sit around the table and work on the PUD – that you're coming to a public hearing in front of us at some point and we don't want to surprise you in our deliberations. We're telegraphing that kind of in our conversation right now. Consider our concerns. Maybe you can address some of them before you bring it to us. When you bring it to us, we're going to have to have a conversation. I would suggest the PUD doesn't come to us in a public hearing first. I think the PUD should come to us in a work session first.

Chair Lohman: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Easton: And at least give the Commission some opportunity to be heard by the stakeholders. Now that doesn't mean that they'll change necessarily everything that we are concerned about, but it's sure going to make it – make the path towards approval – it probably will improve its possibilities. So, hopefully with Kevin's agreement, I'm going to withdraw the motion for approval of the whole document.

Mr. Meenaghan: So my question to that is, Can we simply amend the motion?

Mr. Easton: I think it would be cleaner to just – because then we'd have to amend out everything that – it would be like a double negative.

Chair Lohman: Why don't you ask the Commission what they want to do with the motion?

Mr. Easton: The seconder's asking me first before we withdraw – I haven't withdrawn it yet because he hasn't agreed.

Chair Lohman: All right.

Mr. Easton: I think it would be cleaner to pass –

Chair Lohman: Start over?

Mr. Easton: – to pass just the one section than to try to amend out the other sections. But that's just – I mean, I'll open it to suggestions.

Mr. Johnson: So Ryan Walters did, as he was heading out the door for his other engagements, say it needs to be an affirmative recommendation, and if that's affirmatively to deny something that's fine. But don't *not* recommend something – if that helps.

Chair Lohman: Right.

Mr. Easton: So maybe with that – I don't know – with that statement, should we –

Chair Lohman: Well, you could make the motion that you support the rezoning of the 110 acres – expansion of the BR Light Industrial zone, Bayview Ridge Light Industrial zone, to approximately 110 acres. Because I don't think anybody's having any trouble with that.

Several Commissioners: Right.

Chair Lohman: Dave?

Mr. Hughes: Do we need to downsize the Community Center to get that 110 acres?

Mr. Pernula: Yes.

Mr. Easton: Yes. So that's part of it.

Chair Lohman: Yes.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah.

Mr. Hughes: As I said earlier, I just believe that downsize it to the 7 acres and with the site to be determined at PUD time.

Chair Lohman: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: All right. So with the agreement of the second, I'll remove – I'm going to withdraw the motion for approval of the whole, and now we will –

Mr. Meenaghan: I'm in agreement with that.

Mr. Easton: – thank you – we will attempt to make a motion to address those two issues then, the 110 and the – I think the language – I'm using the language in that introductory paragraph.

Chair Lohman: It's on –

Mr. Easton: Let me look at this. Bear with me for a second.

Mr. Hughes: While you have it on that map and he's looking, that flex area that's – at PUD time that could still go to LI? Or is that – that's to be determined at a later date? And just, while he's still looking, another question – I don't know if it's to Jon, but the contours when it starts going downhill, especially at the – what? –

the northeast – that’s more in the residential area and not in the – what we’re going to change to commercial?

Mr. Pernula: Yeah, this is all the flatter parcels of land then.

Mr. Easton: Okay, so I think I’ve settled on how I want to do the motion – suggestion. The page that Kevin has, could you put it on the screen? I think it’d be easier for him to hand it to you than it would be for me to find it. Maybe you already have it. Whatever is easiest for us to read it.

It appears to me that the four of these accomplish the one overarching goal, which is the 110 acres being moved into Industrial. So the first one is obvious. It’s just as it reads.

Chair Lohman: Is it 110 or 111? Because that number is – there’s both numbers. Dale, is it 110 or 111?

Mr. Meenaghan: The first line says “approximately 110,” and then second and third line down it says “additional 111.” So it’s probably 110-point something.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah, I think –

Mr. Pernula: I think that’s correct.

Mr. Easton: Okay.

Chair Lohman: It’s between 110 and 111?

Mr. Pernula: I think it’s probably closer to 111.

Mr. Meenaghan: It’s a GIS number. It’s acres. I’ve seen those.

Mr. Pernula: It’s not land that’s been totally surveyed.

Chair Lohman: Okay. It does say “approximately” on _____.

Mr. Easton: So if you could push this up a little bit for me. It would appear to me that the rest of this – go ahead; you can go up more.

Mr. Greenwood: If you add up the – excuse me –

Mr. Easton: Go ahead.

Mr. Greenwood: – the 49, 39 and 23 you get a different number still.

Mr. Easton: Don’t say it out loud!

Mr. Greenwood: Okay.

Chair Lohman: We need a split-screen.

Mr. Easton: Yeah. So the expansion; the moving of the BR-CC, and that includes – that paragraph includes the downsizing that Dave was talking about.

Chair Lohman: I don't think "moving" – just "reducing." Site to be determined.

Mr. Easton: Okay, so when we pick it we would drop the line "moving"?

Chair Lohman: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Easton: We'll just pick it up from "downsizing"?

Chair Lohman: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Easton: Then number 3: Reducing the size of the BR-R zone by approximately 55.8 acres. This includes a shift of 49 acres to the BL zone. This is part of accomplishing the 110 so it needs to be included. And then push it up again a little bit please, Kirk. Up – my up so I can read it. And then identify a flex area where the BR-R zone, approximately 76 acres, could be shifted to in the future based on market factors. Is that necessary to accomplish the 110?

Mr. Pernula: I think that's for the flex area, not the 110.

Chair Lohman: That's just in addition.

Mr. Pernula: That's in addition to the 110 acres.

(several people speaking at the same time)

Mr. Hughes: _____. Take more residential out and add more of this commercial.

Chair Lohman: Oh.

Mr. Easton: So who would do the identifying? Is that – in the way this is written? The County? Maybe Gary knows. Gary?

Mr. Christensen: It'd be through the GMA Steering Committee process.

Mr. Easton: Oh.

Mr. Pernula: See, right now we're maxed out on the industrial allocation.

Mr. Easton: Oh, that's – oh, okay.

Mr. Johnson: Well, what do you mean by identifying it? Identifying that there's acreage allocation that's available to the County as opposed to which acres of the 78 –

Mr. Easton: You've got to go in front of the GMA and to us and then send it back to SCOG before it can be _____.

Mr. Johnson: So basically the 110 is what the County currently has allocated to it that it can put on the map, and beyond that we don't have that and so we need to wait. As Patsy Martin said earlier, we're moving into looking at population and employment projections for the next twenty-year period.

Mr. Easton: This sort of telegraphs the fact that the County's considering the idea that we need more Light Industrial than 110 up there? The Port's shaking their heads. The County's – for those of you at home, some members of the staff are shaking their heads "yes."

Chair Lohman: Yes?

Mr. Easton: Yes? Are we telegraphing that we want more than 110 acres of Light Industrial? I mean we're –

Mr. Pernula: It may be that we want it, but we've got to demonstrate that we have the need for it at a certain period of time.

Mr. Easton: The need for it.

Mr. Pernula: Yeah.

Ms. Nakis: So that means that 200 acres that the Port has right now plus –

Mr. Easton: Is there a consen – can I get a consensus from the Commissioners about whether they want this piece a part of the puzzle? A part of the motion? I'm sort of polling you all. Does this section give you heartburn or do you –

Mr. Hughes: Of having –

Mr. Easton: This last, the fourth piece.

Chair Lohman: The last piece.

Mr. Hughes: I think it gives an alternative for residential down the road.

Mr. Easton: I mean, I'm comfortable with it.

Mr. Hughes: I am too. I like it.

Mr. Easton: I will include it in the motion. Then you can argue: take it out by amendment or take it down – either way.

All right, so here's my motion. This is going to be awesome. Watch this.

Chair Lohman: May I write it?

Mr. Easton: No, you're not going to be able to write it. You're going to want to read it off the screen.

I move that we accept the following changes to the Bayview Ridge Area Subarea Plan: Starting with the word "expansion" all the way to the word "zone" – "BR-LI zone" – with one strikethrough. So you could – Kirk, you could copy and paste this section into maybe one screen and then show the strikeout, if you want, and then – but strike out the words "moving the BR-CC zone slightly to the east and north." So the sentence actually starts with "Downsize."

Mr. Johnson: So this gets struck? I would need to figure out where to go to – if it's even on the website that I could capture it.

Mr. Easton: Yeah, you should be able to get to the Plan on the website off of our page.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah, I don't know if I can copy and paste from it.

Mr. Easton: It's a pdf.

Chairman Lohman: I can on my computer.

Mr. Johnson: Let's see, that's in the Introduction, right? Last page of the Introduction?

Chair Lohman: Grab the flex area one, too.

Mr. Easton: Oh, I'm sorry. It's actually supposed to go all the way through the flex area one, right?

Mr. Johnson: No, I know that. It just didn't let me grab more than I had to begin with.

Mr. Easton: Okay. That's fine.

Mr. Johnson: So I'll do it in chunks.

Mr. Easton: Is this making sense? Does it make sense?

Chair Lohman: For the public, this is the painful part of writing on TV.

Mr. Easton: This is a lot better than not writing it ourselves. We had problems with that in the past. So I'll take writing painfully on TV over –

Mr. Greenwood: Don't they do commercials or something? Can't they break for a commercial while we're doing this?

Chair Lohman: Music?

Mr. Greenwood: Yeah.

Chair Lohman: Are you offering to dance or sing?

Mr. Greenwood: No, no, no!

Mr. Easton: Okay, let's check to make sure we got the strikethrough right. All right, so take out the words "moving" – starting at "moving" all the way through to –

Mr. Meenaghan: Strike it out.

Mr. Easton: Yeah. I'm just going to have him take it all the way off.

Chair Lohman: Just strike it so we can see.

Mr. Temples: Yeah, strike it to start with.

Mr. Easton: All right, strike it to see it.

Mr. Johnson: All the way to where?

Mr. Easton: No, back – right there, "and." Take "and" out. Strike that, please. Okay, that's what I intend to make as a motion.

Mr. Meenaghan: And shouldn't it say "downsize BR-CC from 40 to approximately 7"?

Mr. Easton: Yeah. So change – capitalize "downsize" and Kevin's right: add the words "Downsize" and then put "BR-CC." "BR dash CC." That should cover it, right?

Chair Lohman: So do you have a second?

Mr. Easton: Yeah, does anybody dare to second this?

Mr. Meenaghan: I would second it. I *will* second it.

Mr. Easton: Thank you. It's so redeeming when that happens.

Chair Lohman: With the permission of the Planning Commission, I'm going to say that we have a motion and a second to accept the following changes to the Bayview Subarea Plan.

Ms. Nakis: I see another problem here. You'll need to remove the 25-acre community park.

Chair Lohman: No.

Ms. Nakis: You don't?

Mr. Easton: It states the fact that it was there in 2008.

Chair Lohman: It's saying why it was originally 40. It's because of the 25-acre community park.

Mr. Easton: I'm not opposed to taking it out, but...

Ms. Nakis: Okay.

Chair Lohman: So we have a motion and a second that we –

Mr. Johnson: – yeah.

Chair Lohman: – accept what's on the screen.

Mr. Easton: Is there a question or clarification, Kirk?

Mr. Johnson: Well, Mr. Sitkin has a comment that I think he would be the best to offer, rather than I.

Mr. Easton: If it's all right with the Chair it's all right with me.

Chair Lohman: We have a redundancy.

Mr. Sitkin: So my question is: I appreciate what you're doing – Jon Sitkin, for the record, again – and I just want to – the map that you have shows the BR-CC being on both sides, and I understand your motion is not endorsing that. So that

opens the question of where that final map will be located. Without having you do surgery for the moment, you might defer that to staff to include in their recommendations to the Board of Commissioners _____ location. We'd prefer it going to at least the fire station. It would seem to make more sense for where the future BR-CC would be, recognizing not being on both sides of the road. But if you're doing surgery of where it's to be located, then I would suggest if you want to do the surgery include that as part of your motion. We would ask you to consider putting that on the east side of the fire station.

Ms. Nakis: And where is the fire station?

Mr. Sitkin: The dark green.

Chair Lohman: See the fire station is –

Mr. Greenwood: The hatch?

Mr. Sitkin: The hatch.

Chair Lohman: So put it – the little light green square?

Mr. Sitkin: Yes, essentially that direction.

Mr. Greenwood: Is that so the kids can play on the fire trucks or what?

(laughter)

Mr. Sitkin: _____. It's making efficient use of the industrial area, rather than having that truly in the BR-CC. That's –

Mr. Greenwood: That makes sense.

Mr. Easton: Matt? Matt had a question.

Mr. Sitkin: It's a mapping question Board of Commissioners when they understand what you're seeking in your recommendations.

Mr. Easton: So he gives us two recommendations. We don't have to take either one of them. It's nice of him to offer them, though. One is to move them to – one of them's to move them to where they want it, which is on the east side around the fire station. The other is to punt it and make a note of it that we're punting it to staff to make a recommendation to the Commissioners.

Ms. Nakis: But not to have it straddle Peterson Road.

Mr. Easton: Neither of the suggestions straddle –

Mr. Hughes: Jon, are you comfortable with either one of those?

Mr. Sitkin: I'm comfortable with either one of those. I understood you saying you don't want to straddle. The map has a straddle so you should address the mapping in some manner.

Mr. Easton: That's a good point. And Elinor asked whether that would address the straddle and it would. Either one of those recommendations would, in theory, because we would say to the Department –

Chair Lohman: Fix the map.

Mr. Easton: – fix the map and don't straddle the one. Don't straddle the road. Do you want to move it to the east or do you want to ask the Department to do it?

Mr. Meenaghan: I'm not convinced we have enough information to make a determination on where it actually ought to be, so we should probably kick it to staff.

Mr. Easton: Recommend that the staff make a recommendation prior to it going to the Commissioners? That's fine. I could live with that.

Chair Lohman: Why don't you leave it as "site to be determined"?

Mr. Temples: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: Because if we leave it as "site to be determined" it still actually exists on this map now when it doesn't – in the Plan – when it doesn't actually exist.

Mr. Hughes: Well, it's going to be determined by staff.

Mr. Easton: If we clarify that. Okay, let's go back to my motion for a minute. Generous to call it a motion. It's more like a story.

Mr. Sitkin: Thank you.

Mr. Easton: You're welcome.

Ms. Nakis: Well, it might end up that it's better that it is adjacent to the new road that would be going between Josh Wilson and Peterson.

Mr. Easton: It could always be moved later.

Ms. Nakis: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: All right, can we flip the screens back to the –

Chair Lohman: Is there flexibility in the Plan and in the potential PUD that if being on Peterson Road *doesn't* work out and they put it on a side road somehow or another – they find an alternative spot. Is there flexibility in the code and in the Plan to allow that kind of thing?

Mr. Pernula: You know, I would have to look at it very carefully. I don't think so but maybe.

Mr. Hughes: Do you need that Community Center to be where the fire department is for the fire department to be in a legal –

Mr. Easton: Nah, they don't have to be legal – aren't they?

Chair Lohman: No. They can be anywhere they want.

Mr. Hughes: I understand that but – they used to be, but –

Chair Lohman: They're an essential public service.

Mr. Pernula: I don't think it's a problem.

Mr. Easton: They don't have to have zoning to – you know?

Chair Lohman: They can trump zoning.

Mr. Easton: The sentence above where it says Recommendation – which I'm going to come back to – but the sentence above there where it starts reducing the size?

Mr. Johnson: Reducing the – oh, sentence about. Okay.

Mr. Easton: Yeah. Strike – just take that off because it's redundant. If you're starting at "reducing," it's actually exactly the same sentence down below.

Mr. Johnson: Oh, okay.

Mr. Easton: Somehow it came over twice when we were inputting it.

Chair Lohman: Okay, the motion is on the screen. Can –

Mr. Easton: Let me – I need to tweak it a little bit more.

Chair Lohman: Is anybody seeing anything else?

Mr. Easton: I don't think that the recommendation for the PDS should be in the middle of the motion, so from a – let's take that and put it in the Recommendations. We can address that without it being in the motion. Thank you. I'm sure there'll be other recommendations but we'll get to that. I'm comfortable if this is the motion, if somebody else wants to second it.

Mr. Meenaghan: I'll second it.

Mr. Easton: Oh.

Mr. Greenwood: I think you already did.

Mr. Easton: We kept changing it, though.

Mr. Greenwood: He was flexing with you.

Mr. Easton: Way to go, buddy!

Ms. Nakis: I did have a question about the flex area within that BR-R zone and being so close to Residential, could there possibly be problems with Light Industrial being sited that close to the Residential areas?

Mr. Easton: Which I think would be best addressed when we deal with it as a PUD.

Mr. Temples: Yeah, I'm kind of feeling like we're trying to jumpstart something that could possibly, realistically not occur for another fifteen to twenty years.

Mr. Easton: That's all stuff that we can deal with when we deal with the PUD.

Mr. Temples: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: For Ryan's – I know for a fact Ryan would not want us to pass a motion that has a strikethrough through it, so now that we've all seen what's struck out let's go ahead and just take it out, because that would look weird.

Mr. Temples: Well, he may not like that!

Mr. Easton: Well, maybe he'll come to the next meeting!

Mr. Greenwood: I think Elinor raises a good point in the potential conflict of density –

Mr. Easton: And that's a great finding of fact.

Mr. Greenwood: it leads to the attachment of Light Industrial's going straight into Residential with the densities that _____.

Mr. Easton: I'm just suggesting that we do that as a finding and not as a part of the motion.

Chair Lohman: Hold on a moment. Dale?

Mr. Hughes: Well, that flex area could be Residential, and it's going to come up to what we're changing right now. It's going to be a line someplace.

Mr. Greenwood: Right. But a transition, I think, is what we were –

Chair Lohman: Right.

Mr. Hughes: But that's, as Jason stated, I think the time for that's a later date.

Chair Lohman: I agree.

Mr. Easton: Yeah.

Mr. Greenwood: I agree.

Mr. Hughes: Because right now we're doing the 110 acres –

Mr. Greenwood: Right.

Mr. Hughes: – and everything east of that is still going to be pasture until something else happens – or grass.

Mr. Pernula: What I think about that is that right now you've got a hard boundary between the Light Industrial zone and the Residential zone. You might have some landscaping, maybe some other requirements. But if you extend that with the PUD you'll be looking at the design of the Residential and the Industrial area together, and I think you could probably end up with something that's more compatible than just a line.

Ms. Nakis: Okay.

Mr. Greenwood: For sure.

Mr. Pernula: So I think you're better off with it.

Mr. Easton: Any more discussion on the motion, and then we can call for the question?

Mr. Mahaffie: I have more discussion.

Chair Lohman: Yep.

Mr. Mahaffie: Not that I disagree with what's going on here, but I'm not comfortable voting for it. And going through the Plan the tables that are going to have to be changed, the wording here in is going to have to be changed. I think it's too much of a can of worms. I think if we – we either have to amend what we have a problem with or pass it as, you know, written. I'm not comfortable. I don't disagree with it but I'm not comfortable with it.

Chair Lohman: Well, they never said this job was going to be easy!

Ms. Nakis: And I'm concerned about taking the 25-acre community park out also. I mean, I understand why that's been taken out but where is it put back in? Is that addressed in the PUD also? Okay.

Chair Lohman: Robert?

Mr. Temples: Well, frankly I'm quite pleased the way the motion has worked out. I think we may be – I don't think we're necessarily setting a precedent here. There is just way too many factors and there're going to be changes through this entire process. I mean the PUD is going to make a lot of adjustment and changing and fine tuning. We're just simply – from what I'm seeing here – accepting or rejecting the concept of transferring 111 acres into Light Industrial which, in the future, might actually be more beneficial to that area. And we may find ourselves five years or ten years down the road going, Oh, my God, Light Industrial's going crazy. We'd better, you know, add another 250 acres to it. So I don't think I would get too – I mean, the location of a community center and all that, I think, as time goes on as development occurs, it's going to start to dictate. Right now you have a puzzle with no pieces – is really what you got until we start to see the pieces go down. We're not going to know how it's going to be developed.

My other concern, which *is* a concern to me, is we're putting a lot of effort, time, County money, time of our citizens, all of this into this project when we, as we saw last week from the Mayor of Sedro-Woolley saying, Look, we've got a lot of resources, too, that need to be fulfilled. And you can see that through almost every city in this county. And yet we're focused on this. So, I mean, we've got vacant buildings all over and, you know, we need to get development of those, too. That's an important thing. And I think we need to get probably more interaction with developers in every level, whether it's commercial or residential, to give us a little bit more insight into all of this. That's – I'm kind of an – honestly a newbie to this county, so I'm trying to learn as fast as I can. But I see a lot of other opportunities in a lot of other places. That's it.

Mr. Easton: Point of order. If it pleases the Board, we're at 8:57 and I think we're close to a vote on this final motion, so I'm going to ask the Chair if we could extend our time to 9:15.

Chair Lohman: Is that –

Mr. Easton: As opposed to adjourning and then coming back on next week.

Mr. Greenwood: Absolutely.

Mr. Temples: Yeah, I agree with that.

Chair Lohman: Yep. Sounds good to me. I mean, I can't – I'm not in charge. We are all in charge and so it sounds like we have a majority. More discussion on the proposed motion?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: So it would not – basically not accept all of the –

Mr. Easton: This is the only thing we're approving.

Chair Lohman: Okay.

Mr. Easton: I want to address that – and as the maker of the motion – something that Elinor said. I think it's an important Finding of Fact, the statement that the Director made when he was – or the statements that have been made on behalf of the Parks Department that they would prefer and still want more – they want pocket parks. And, you know, we can do a Finding of Fact about – you know, to address your issue, your concern about the – I just don't think it would – it would seem very clunky to try to do that in a motion –

Ms. Nakis: Right.

Mr. Easton: – to say, We believe in parks and we want you to find places for parks up there. Right? But come back – make sure we don't forget when we're doing our Findings of Fact.

Ms. Nakis: Okay.

Mr. Hughes: Yeah, to have a 25-acre park and no housing going in other than –

Mr. Easton: Right.

Chair Lohman: Doesn't make sense.

Mr. Easton: Yeah, it doesn't make sense.

Mr. Hughes: ___, you know.

Mr. Easton: It would fit as a Finding of Fact, though.

Chair Lohman: But all of the parks language throughout the Plan is all contingent on –

Mr. Hughes: The PUD.

Chair Lohman: Well, the PUD and if you get that population.

Mr. Hughes: Right.

Chair Lohman: So shall we call for the question? So all those in favor?

Mr. Easton: Are we going to have role call?

Mr. Johnson: Can you see the whole thing, or you know what's there?

Mr. Meenaghan: Actually, can you scroll down to see what the end is?

Chair Lohman: Can you maybe shrink it?

Mr. Johnson: I can shrink it a little, yeah.

Mr. Greenwood: You just had to get the number 110 in there, didn't you? You zoomed it to 110! Why not 111, or 112?

Mr. Easton: 110, 111.

Mr. Meenaghan: Can you scroll down just a little bit to see what's beneath those – yeah, the Findings and Recommendations? There's nothing there.

Mr. Easton: We're not going to vote on the – we're not going to do the Findings yet? Right, Madame Chair? We do those afterwards. We'll do the motion first, then do the Findings?

Chair Lohman: Yes. Both. Are we voting? Dave, do you want to start?

Mr. Hughes: Aye.

Mr. Mahaffie: With reservations, nay.

Mr. Axthelm: Nay.

Chair Lohman: Aye.

Mr. Easton: Aye.

Mr. Temples: Aye.

Mr. Meenaghan: Aye.

Mr. Greenwood: Aye.

Ms. Nakis: Aye.

Chair Lohman: Okay.

Mr. Easton: So Findings.

Chair Lohman: Findings.

Mr. Easton: Well, the first one would be – we could address the parks issue.

Mr. Hughes: Let's go then.

Chair Lohman: Why don't we go in order?

Mr. Temples: That's what my understanding of the parks was that 25-acre parcel is not going to be just one location but could be multiple locations.

Mr. Easton: Do you want to go in order instead and we'll take that one later? Okay, let's go to Findings of Fact – or let's go to Recommendations. We need to go to Recommendations first.

The Planning Commission recommends that the Planning Department schedule a work session prior to the public hearing – excuse me – a work session prior to the finalization of the draft of the PUD ordinance.

Mr. Johnson: Finalization of the draft or of the PUD ordinance?

Mr. Easton: PUD. I know what I'm trying to say but that just doesn't really sound good.

Chair Lohman: I don't think you need to put in the Planning Department.

Mr. Easton: Because obviously it's all us?

Chair Lohman: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: We'll say we recommend – just start with “Recommend.”

Chair Lohman: ...for the Planning Commission...

Mr. Easton: Tell him what you want to do.

Mr. Johnson: Start with “Recommends”?

Chair Lohman: The Planning Commission recommends a work session with the Planning Commission prior to...

Mr. Easton: ...prior to the finalization of the PUD ordinance and the public hearing. With the stakeholders?

Chair Lohman: I think that's suggested by being a work session.

Mr. Easton: Should we make it clear that we want the Port there, the School District and the landowners?

Chair Lohman: Stakeholders.

Mr. Easton: Or just stakeholders then? That's fine. They'll understand.

Mr. Johnson: So prior to finalization and release of the PUD?

Mr. Easton: Yeah, the idea is that we get input before the document's sent to the public.

Chair Lohman: Maybe update the city information, because 1996 to 2013 – that was a great catch, Elinor.

Mr. Easton: Elinor, yeah!

Ms. Nakis: Throughout this whole thing the data's very old in some instances.

Mr. Johnson: Actually there was a pretty extensive effort to go through and update the data. I think one of the references to 1996 was as part of a historical account – that in 1996, this Countywide Planning Policy said this.

Mr. Easton: You got Elinor to shake her head “no” on that one!

Ms. Nakis: No, it's all – every one of the cities it's about the capacity.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah. So what's the timeframe on updating the city data that you're thinking? Is that –

Mr. Easton: I mean like if you do it before it goes to the – could you do it before it goes to the Commissioners?

Mr. Johnson: I don't know. I mean, we're scheduled starting this month and into the next several months of the new year to have those discussions with the Cities in relation to the 2035 update to the Comprehensive Plan. So I guess we could send those texts out to the various Cities and say, Would you change anything here? We could do that fairly quickly. We can't really sit down with all of the Cities and say –

Mr. Easton: Sure, and it might end up being that it's a technical thing that we adopt again next year when the Comp Plan amendments come before us.

Chair Lohman: Matt?

Mr. Temples: Kirk, I'd like to find out – I guess this is a recommendation, if I can do this correctly – that we also get some type of update and information from the major Cities in the county as to their development plans and projections. In other words, we're looking at Bayview and I'd be interested to see what is the information, as an example, from Sedro and Mount Vernon and Anacortes and La Conner, et cetera, et cetera. It doesn't even have to be lengthy. It could just be – I mean, obviously Mayor Mike Anderson came in. He made some comments that were very valid. And I'd be kind of curious to hear what some of the other mayors feel about their particular town.

Chair Lohman: Matt's got a question.

Mr. Mahaffie: So if the Commissioners accept this, you would now have a Subarea Plan linked to the Comprehensive Plan that is not in error by updates, but now we have changed mapping. All the tables are wrong. Statistics are wrong in acreage. How does that get fixed, or does it have to?

Mr. Johnson: No. So your recommendation came directly from the description of the amended Subarea Plan and so to the extent that you didn't change the acres – the 110 additional Light Industrial coming from these zones – that is all reflected in the tables and the text of the Subarea Plan, because that was the proposal connected to the Comp Plan.

Mr. Mahaffie: So that will change with it?

Mr. Johnson: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: If we had changed the number it would have been different.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah.

Chair Lohman: Yeah.

Mr. Easton: If we said they could only bring 90 in or something like that.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah, that would have, but as long as you're consistent with what was proposed then all the tables and all the text acreage references should be correct.

Mr. Easton: Elinor, you should do something about parks – if you want to.

Ms. Nakis: Just that – I'm not sure how to word it – just that parks are important to the mix of residential areas. They need to be addressed.

Mr. Easton: Maybe we add the sentence, Small parks scattered throughout the Subarea Plan would be a desirable result for the Planning Commission?

Ms. Nakis: Right. Yes.

Chair Lohman: Kirk, can you go back to the motion a second? A recommendation would be to change the land use plan map so that it matches the reduction in the Bayview Ridge Community Center. Wasn't that the only map error from what got proposed?

Mr. Johnson: So there's this line hanging out there: Fix the map but don't straddle the road. Do you want that –

Mr. Easton: Yeah, we need that.

Chair Lohman: Yeah. Just make it nicer.

Mr. Easton: We're recommending that staff propose a location for the BR-CC prior to the Commissioners voting on this motion. Right? Is that what we agreed? Instead of us locating it, we recommended that the staff recommend a location for the BR-CC – the reduced BR-CC – to be reviewed prior to – or be available to the Commissioners prior to their deliberations.

Chair Lohman: Dave, does that capture what you commented on?

(no audible response)

Chair Lohman: Well, I think we're also recommending that we not adopt the language that is more specific to the PUD plan, which is why we went with such a streamlined motion.

Mr. Easton: We recommend to the Commissioners to *not* do anything other than what we did, basically. I mean, that's what she's saying. She's saying that we're recommending to them that they keep it simple to just this portion and that the rest wait for a more appropriate time.

Mr. Johnson: So change it to say "approve *only* the following changes"?

Mr. Easton: Yeah. Sure.

Chair Lohman: Does that change our motion?

Mr. Easton: No. It's just the wording before the motion. He just adds the word "approve *only* the following changes."

Mr. Axthelm: Should we just specify "and strike the other"?

Mr. Easton: Have we given them any logic for why we decided not to approve any of the other pieces? I think we probably need a Finding like that, Annie.

Chair Lohman: Well, I think it's more appropriate for the PUD.

Mr. Easton: That'd be a Finding instead of a Recommendation.

Mr. Greenwood: Or at least that it – well, I was going to say at least that it goes along *with* the PUD, but it sounds like it needs to be in the PUD and not in this document.

Mr. Easton: So we need to add a section of findings and put it under Findings?

Mr. Johnson: These Recommendations –

Mr. Easton: We didn't. We don't have a –

Mr. Johnson: Those are Findings of Fact and I haven't done ____.

Chair Lohman: Would it be Reasoning?

Mr. Easton: Oh, we need to look at these, don't we? These are the pre – wow, we've got to get some of this – we're going to have to check these because these were the ones that were pre-written.

Mr. Greenwood: (c), we'd need to remove (c). Were we approving updates of the Capital Facilities chapter or no? In our motion?

Chair Lohman: We would eliminate (c) ____.

Mr. Greenwood: So we would get rid of the next (c) also.

Mr. Easton: Yeah, the new (c).

Mr. Temples: Where are you all now?

Chair Lohman: Right above Recommendations.

Mr. Easton: 4(c) needs to be struck, please. Can you scroll up? You're fast! Take 4(c) out. Right?

Mr. Greenwood: Correct.

Chair Lohman: Oh, you did it. Okay.

Mr. Easton: He hadn't done it yet. He took the first one out – I mean he took the second one out. Go ahead and take (c) out and put – (d) will move up to (c).

Chair Lohman: Wait.

Mr. Easton: We are updating the Capital Facilities chapter to reflect current plans, are we? It's on the motion. Don't look at your paper. It's kind of confusing.

Chair Lohman: Okay.

Mr. Johnson: You had some criticism that the facts and figures aren't up to date, so this would be removing some of those that were brought up to date. Just point that out.

Mr. Easton: I guess I can live with it in there. I just didn't think we were doing anything _____.

(several Commissioners talking at the same time)

Mr. Pernula: Okay, I'm getting a little bit confused on what's happening here. On item number 4 I think you said the proposal would make *only* the following changes to Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan. Is that correct?

Mr. Easton: Right. We added the word "only."

Mr. Pernula: And it would include these, so it wouldn't include any of the updates of any of the tables or anything like that. Correct?

Chair Lohman: No. It would if it corresponded to the motion.

Mr. Easton: It would if it corresponds to the motion, which we'll probably make that as a Finding.

Mr. Pernula: You're not saying that in what _____.

Mr. Easton: We haven't yet. We haven't yet. We're trying to clarify updates to the Capital Facilities chapter as something we actually want. I want everything that's involved in the motion that causes something in the Plan to need to be changed to be reflected in the Findings of Fact. So, Kirk, however you want to word that, but it updates – in light of the motion, update the Plan to reflect it. So that could include the Capital Facilities – we have numbers – okay, so one thing in the Capital Facility Plan that will change is the number of acres that are in Light Industrial, because the current number doesn't include that 110 today, or 111.

Chair Lohman: But the table was not updated

Mr. Temples: Update plans and tables.

Mr. Axthelm: Do you want that in Findings of Fact, not in the Recommendations?

Mr. Easton: It's not actually a Finding of Fact. It probably is a Recommendation.

Mr. Axthelm: You kept saying Finding of Facts, though.

Mr. Easton: Yeah, you're right though. It's not. It's a Recommendation. It's not an actual fact. Can you go back up, please, to the Findings? Before you do, go ahead and take that recommendation to PDS out. Perfect. Go back up to the Findings. So to the Commission I'm asking, Does updates to the Capital Facilities chapter – Kirk's saying that that – do you think we should leave that in?

Chair Lohman: No.

Mr. Greenwood: No.

Mr. Johnson: I was _____ –

Mr. Meenaghan: You can take that out and that recommendation just put in as number 1 down there will cover that.

Mr. Easton: He just did. Okay, then that's redundant. Then take (c) out.

Chair Lohman: Well, do we –

Mr. Easton: Clearly Ryan thought that – by using the phrase – Capital Facilities was important.

Chair Lohman: It is a chapter. It's chapter 7.

Mr. Easton: I guess if it's not – it's not hurting anything to leave it. If it helps keep the documents to be reflective of the changes and keep them consistent, then let's just leave it in.

Mr. Johnson: Right. Our plans need to be internally consistent _____.

Mr. Easton: Internal consistency.

Chair Lohman: But the recommendation then needs to include that we update the Capital Facilities chapter.

Ms. Nakis: So maybe just "update" – yeah, just instead of "updates to the"?

Mr. Easton: Just change it to "update"?

Mr. Axthelm: He had the whole ____.

Chair Lohman: _____, so I think you need to basically cut and paste that chapter in the Recommendation – that we *want* the updates to the Capital Facilities Plan, correct? Maybe if we –

Mr. Easton: We don't have to put the whole chapter there. We can just tell them – we can ask them to do it.

Mr. Greenwood: Well, that gets us a little closer to what Matt was getting at, which was – I think – was that we start looking at what we like and what we don't like in these changes, and then we'll start to get to making those little changes in the parts that we did like and the parts that we didn't like.

Chair Lohman: And it is past 9:15.

Mr. Easton: Do you guys want to come back next week or do you want to finish?

Mr. Temples: Depends on how long it takes us to finish.

(laughter)

Mr. Greenwood: I don't mind finishing _____?

Mr. Easton: Yeah, this is the only thing that would be on our agenda for next week.

Mr. Temples: Do it until 9:30 and then be done?

Mr. Easton: I think we're there.

Mr. Johnson: Okay, so __ example but the currently adopted Plan, not the proposal, I think has the wrong name for the Bayview Business Park. And so the proposed Plan would fix that. I think it would change the Port of Skagit County to the Port of Skagit. So we would lose those sorts of things – I just want to bring that to your attention – by rejecting any other Plan changes other than those related to acreage. I'm just bringing that up.

Mr. Easton: I'm willing to amend my motion to honor the Port's desire to drop the word "County" from their name.

(laughter)

Mr. Greenwood: I don't think it matters. Come on – does it? Can't that be handled when we make this update with the PUD?

Mr. Easton: There are people who are really concerned about this when they read this Plan and see the word "County" there. It's about –

Mr. Greenwood: Not when they see the date on it.

Mr. Easton: In 1996.

Mr. Greenwood: Yeah. Call it whatever you want then.

Mr. Easton: What was the other one? That the –

Chair Lohman: I think that we could put a recommendation that we correct current data, scrivener's errors and names of things to what they're currently called. Could we say that as a recommendation?

Mr. Easton: I thought we had one that said something like that already. Yeah, just add the word "Update" their names. That scrivener, man. He's always making errors. This is the time when Dave starts telling stories about how they used to have Planning Commission meetings till eleven o'clock at night!

Chair Lohman: We're not doing that.

Mr. Easton: And on Saturdays! This is when you used to tell me stories. We'd get past 9:15 and you used to tell me stories about, Remember when we used to go to eleven!

Chair Lohman: Okay. Okay, that's enough. Is there any other recommendations from the Commissioners?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Nobody has said anything about the school. Did anybody want to?

Mr. Easton: I don't want to say anything about the school.

Mr. Meenaghan: The school is –

Mr. Easton: I waited until the school left to say that!

Mr. Meenaghan: Madame Chair, the school issue is irrelevant to these four pieces that we're talking about here.

Mr. Axthelm: Yeah.

Chair Lohman: Okay.

Mr. Easton: We could recommend that they continue to work together, but they're going to do it anyway.

Mr. Meenaghan: Well, and the school's a need. You know that.

Chair Lohman: Okay, any other Findings of Fact?

Mr. Greenwood: Is the school relevant to our rejection of these changes?

Mr. Temples: I don't think we know enough about their plan at this point.

Mr. Easton: No, I don't think so.

Chair Lohman: All we really know is that the DOT strongly recommends against locating a school.

Mr. Temples: And that's all it is: their recommendation.

Chair Lohman: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Easton: We're supporting the decoupling of the PUD.

(several Commissioners speaking at the same time)

Chair Lohman: We haven't said anything about the transportation section. Did anybody want to say something about that?

Mr. Easton: I'm going to reserve my comments about transportation for the future and, boy, there's going to be _____ to talk about.

Mr. Temples: I don't think we have enough information at this point.

Ms. Nakis: Is this the newest update that we have on the Bayview Ridge Fiscal Impact Analysis, October 2nd?

Chair Lohman: And then we got a –

Mr. Easton: No, there's an amendment.

Mr. Temples: Yeah, there's an amendment.

Mr. Easton: It was a significant amendment.

Ms. Nakis: Yeah, I thought I read it but I couldn't find it. Okay.

Chair Lohman: Anything else?

(silence)

Chair Lohman: Matt, did you have anything? Okay.

Mr. Easton: Next item on the agenda.

Mr. Johnson: I believe the way the recorded motion is drafted, you're expected to take a vote on the overall recommendation.

Mr. Easton: Oh, that's right. We have to vote on the whole thing.

Chair Lohman: The overall –

Mr. Easton: Because they're all drafted together. So I move to accept the whole Plan as presented.

Mr. Temples: I second it.

Chair Lohman: Wait. We didn't.

Mr. Easton: No, what happens is we pass each individual plan inside the Plan. Now we have to pass the whole thing. Is that right, Dale?

Chair Lohman: I don't think so.

Mr. Easton: Well, I know that Ryan's had to do that before.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah, I mean I think in the past we've done it sometimes where you vote on each individual component and then other times you vote again on the whole thing. I'm not an attorney.

Chair Lohman: I don't think this one lends itself to an overall vote.

Mr. Greenwood: Last year we did it individually, too.

Chair Lohman: Yeah. I think we need to keep them separate.

Mr. Easton: That's true and we did have separate public hearings. That's a good argument. I don't care.

Chair Lohman: We've already voted. I think you just need to put that with each one.

Mr. Johnson: Okay.

Chair Lohman: Thank you for the public for –

Mr. Easton: – bearing with us.

Chair Lohman: Okay, Department Updates.

Mr. Pernula: Okay, a couple of things. First of all, you were sent a copy of the Transportation Improvement Program for 2014 through 2019 and it also mentioned that there would be a public hearing held on it before the Board of County Commissioners on November 26 at 10:30 a.m. It actually says 10. It says 10:30 then 10. I'm not sure which time it is. But it also mentions that next year the TIP and the Capital Facilities Program will be released at the same time and there will be a hearing before the Planning Commission – okay? So it's going to be a little bit different next year, but this year the hearing will be held on November 26.

The next thing I'd like to talk about is the December meeting – whether or not we're going to have it. I thought maybe we could have the PUD work session, but I'm not sure we'll be ready. We've had many work sessions where we've gone over the design standards and how everything's going to work, but the essential issue of how we're going to deal with the school issue may not be resolved by that time. So it seems like it's more of a school issue than it is directly the PUD issue, if I'm reading what you want right.

Mr. Easton: So historically we haven't met in December unless it was urgent, and I wouldn't score – I don't think we're ready for the – I don't think all the stakeholders are going to be ready. That's my opinion.

Mr. Pernula: Okay.

Mr. Greenwood: Is there no opportunity for a work session on the other elements of this Subarea Plan?

Mr. Easton: I think that's tied to the PUD.

Mr. Pernula: It's too late. It would have to be – it would be a Comprehensive Plan Amendment –

Mr. Greenwood: I don't mean to get it passed now. I just mean to get it – if we're going to do a work session, those tend to take more than one meeting.

Mr. Easton: I think it needs to wait till the new year. Do you think _____?

Chair Lohman: I have no idea.

Mr. Easton: Well, there's one stakeholder in the back shaking their heads "no."

Unidentified male voice in the audience: We want to sit down with the County _____. That won't happen by Christmas.

Chair Lohman: So the November 19th meeting is not going to happen?

Mr. Pernula: It's not going to happen on the 19th and apparently it won't happen in December either unless something else comes up.

Mr. Meenaghan: Is there anything else we could be prepping for, you know, for January, February, March that we could –

Mr. Pernula: Soon you should have some drafts either as a whole or in pieces of the Shoreline Master Program. That'll come up a little later.

Mr. Easton: You don't think she's going to be ready for something in December, do you?

Mr. Pernula: I hope so, but it's probably going to be more like the first of the year.

Mr. Easton: We do officers at the first of the year.

Mr. Pernula: If we can get it in in December, we will.

Chair Lohman: So there's no – our next regular meeting is December – the first week in December, and there's no chance of the PUD ordinance being ready then?

Mr. Pernula: Well, all the regulations are all ready to go. It's totally ready. What's not ready is addressing the school issue.

Chair Lohman: I think we should – my opinion – it's the rule of the Commission – we should keep our December meeting in case we need it.

Mr. Meenaghan: Yeah, it's easier to cancel it. Fine – that's fine.

Mr. Greenwood: I agree.

Mr. Pernula: Okay.

Ms. Ehlers: Do we have to do that whole Shoreline mess as one lump?

Chair Lohman: Out of order. I'm sorry. Dale?

Mr. Pernula: We may hand it to the Planning Commission as a lump, but the way it's going to be reviewed will probably be in pieces.

Chair Lohman: But what concerns me is like tonight we're feeling a lot of urgency that we get this Subarea Plan done, and here we are November 12th and we're out of days. And I just don't like the precedent of jamming stuff that's really critical that you get it done in end-year, that we jam it to the last of the – the last month or so of the year. It's just not good. It doesn't look good to the public because we're not getting 'er done. I realize that sometimes things come up and get moved but it makes it really difficult to meaningfully examine it and do our job like we need to.

Okay, was that it for the Department?

Mr. Pernula: (inaudible)

Chair Lohman: Okay, the Planning Commissioner Comments? I guess that was my comment.

Mr. Easton: Let's not meet in December just to meet. I mean, let's make sure we have a full agenda. In my opinion, that's – I want to be on the record saying I'm not interested in a one-hour meeting just because we have December 5th open. Which could mean that we won't see Elinor ever again on the Commission, so I want to thank her for her service. If you come to the December meeting or not, I'll thank you again!

Mr. Greenwood: You know, we could have the December meeting a party for Elinor! She could just come and we could surprise her, huh?

(several unintelligible comments from Commissioners)

Chair Lohman: Second? Adjourn? We're adjourned (gavel).