

**Skagit County Planning Commission
Public Hearing: Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) and
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 2019-2024
November 20, 2018**

Planning

Commissioners: Tim Raschko, Chair (absent)
Kathy Mitchell, Vice Chair/Acting Chair
Mark Lundsten
Annie Lohman
Amy Hughes (absent)
Josh Axthelm
Tammy Candler (absent)
Hollie Del Vecchio (absent)
Martha Rose

Staff: Hal Hart, Planning Director
Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner
Andrew Graminski, Intern
Nick Schmeck, Intern

Public Remarks

Commenters: Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County

Acting Chair Kathy Mitchell: Good evening. I call this (gavel) special meeting of the November 20th Skagit County Planning Commission to order. I see that we do have a quorum. Are there any changes or additions to the agenda?

Commissioner Annie Lohman: Madame Chair, can we add Public Remarks as the first thing on the agenda?

Chair Mitchell: That's fine. Everybody else okay with that?

(sounds of assent)

Chair Mitchell: Okay, let's do that. So for public comments, if anybody would like to speak we would like to limit it to three minutes to five minutes, if need be, for this evening. If you'll please state your name and come to the podium.

Ellen Bynum: Good evening, Commissioners. Ellen Bynum, Friends of Skagit County, 110 North 1st, Mount Vernon. And I just wanted to – for the purpose of your thinking about how you do updates for the Comprehensive Plan – bring to your attention that we don't have a formal plan to update the Countywide comprehensive Planning Policies. We have allowed that – because it involves the Cities and the County, we often have SCOG do some of that work. And each year we look at item number 1, which is the population allocation that you have to decide upon that comes from the Office of Financial Management at the State, and then the Counties and the Cities work on the numbers, and so item number 1 in the policies gets changed every year. But we haven't done updates and SCOG's staff have put a proposal forward to do an update on that.

But I'm more interested in talking about how we got those policies in the first place. So I was not here so I'm telling you this, you know, secondhand but I'm hoping I'm getting it right. And we don't have any people who participated in it in the room, but I think in the original organization of the citizens advisory groups that worked on the Comprehensive Plan to write the very first Comprehensive Plan there was also an exercise of doing a visioning process. And this was asking groups of people in the county what they wanted the county to look like. And I know this because I have a – one of four newspapers, which I don't know if the staff have any of. If you've never seen them, you might want to look at them because they gave us a pretty good roadmap for what we did with what people thought were important.

Basically we asked people what they wanted to conserve and what they thought was important for the economy and what they thought Skagit should look like. If you take those questions and you ask them again today – because we've done it in the – they did it in the – as early as the '70s, before we ever had GMA. They did a comprehensive plan in the '70s and they asked that – you will find that a lot of the same activities come up. And so those activities – conserving farmland, protecting agriculture, protecting forestry, protecting wetlands, working on environmental policies – that sort of thing. That was all put into the policies. But the policies don't fit within the framework of the annual Comprehensive Plan update that you do. And my question to you is: Should it? And you have to realize that it also involves the cities and the towns, so how would we create a process that involved people that lived in cities and towns? I don't think in the beginning they made a distinction between if you lived in a city. They just said, you know, You can come to these meetings and comment on the county policy. But I know now there's a lot of rural residents who think that the rural residents should have more say than the people in the town telling them what to do. So we probably need to think about a process that would enable us to, you know, review what we have, keep the pieces that we think are very good and the things that we legally have to keep, and then revise the rest of it and get a process for public comment going that either dovetails with the annual Comprehensive Plan update – which would be the simplest way to do it – or somehow interfaces with SCOG. Nothing hard, right? Just a little simple task. So thanks very much for your time.

Chair Mitchell: Thank you, Ellen.

Okay, moving on to the Public Hearing portion: The purpose of this public hearing tonight is for proposed updates to the County's Capital Facilities Plan and Transportation Improvement Plan 2019 through 2024. Notable updates this year include new interlocal agreement with Anacortes to collect transportation impact fees in the UGA, and a new line item for the proposed Guemes ferry. Public Works has provided a synopsis of the proposed new remaining emergency and deleted projects, as well.

The comment period will end at 4:30 on Friday, November 23rd. That's this coming Friday. We extend it an extra day because of the holiday. Our deliberations will be next Tuesday on November 27th, 6 p.m.

So the purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony and written correspondence to consider proposed annual updates for the Capital Facilities/TIP plan. There is a signup sheet in the back of the room for those who would like to testify. Before you do, please clearly state your name, spelling your last name, and give us your address. A recording system will record the oral comments. Written comments will be accepted and can be placed in the box located on the table over with staff and submitted to the Planning Department Services until 4:30 p.m. on Friday.

So we will begin by taking the public comments and then staff will give a brief presentation about the proposal, and thank you for your time to participate. So are there any takers?

(unintelligible voice)

Chair Mitchell: Okay, so, Stacie, could you please help us with the presentation? Thank you.

Stacie Pratschner: Thank you, Madame Chair, for that introduction. Good evening to all the Planning Commissioners, to our members of staff who are here today, and thank you to the member of the public who came out this evening. As always, thank you for having me here as well.

So today we are holding the public hearing for the proposed annual updates to the Skagit County Capital Facilities Plan, and that's managed and prepared by the Planning Department, and also the Transportation Improvement Program, which is managed and prepared by our Public Works Department.

The purpose of capital facilities planning is to ensure that a jurisdiction provides adequate public facilities – streets, water systems, fire protection services, schools, to name a few – to serve both existing and new development, and then ensure that those facilities are in place when development occurs. The Capital Facilities Plan is meant to demonstrate that the County has a realistic plan to provide the needed facilities to serve development at the level of service standards adopted in order to ultimately implement the vision of the Comprehensive Plan.

The County's Capital Facilities Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program – those are both six-year plans, and this update concerns 2019 to 2024 of capital projects with estimated costs and also proposed methods of financing. The Transportation Improvement Program is incorporated by reference into the Capital Facilities Plan, and that includes the financing plans for roads and also non-motorized transportation projects.

The Planning Department on an annual basis begins outreach to our partner agencies in about the middle of the year to request their updated capital facilities plans and then to incorporate those updates into our own plan. Once that draft is completed, the documents are then released for public review and comment, usually in the fall of that year, and then we have a public hearing with the Planning Commission where ultimately a recommendation is made by the Planning Commission to the Board of County Commissioners to adopt the changes – the proposed changes. The Board then decides in concurrence with our County budget to adopt the updates.

So as described by the Chair, there are two notable updates this year, including the establishment of an interlocal with the City of Anacortes, and this is to collect their transportation impact fees within their as-now-unincorporated urban growth area.

We also have updates in the Transportation Improvement Plan to reflect the potential replacement of the Guemes Island Ferry.

So as of this evening, the Department is not in receipt of any written comments, either e-mail or hand-written, concerning any of the proposed updates. I also confirmed with the Public Works Department that they're not in receipt of any comments at this time either.

So the Department concludes at this point that this year's annual updates to the Capital Facilities Plan – and that includes by reference the TIP – the CFP and the TIP are consistent with our Land

Use element of the Comprehensive Plan because our proposed financing for the needed facilities will be able to support our plan at our adopted levels of service.

On this last slide, I have included some additional information. As stated by the Chair, the comment period's going to extend to the end of this week. I've also listed the project website if folks need some further information.

I appreciate your time and I'd be happy to answer any questions about this year's updates.

Chair Mitchell: Anybody have any questions for Stacie?

(silence)

Ms. Pratschner: Madame Chair, could I also note just for the record that prior to the deliberations next week we do want to go back and clean up some of the formatting? So no substantial changes, but we want to take a close look just to make sure some grammar and spelling are correct. With the annual update, sometimes things get updated and the rest of the sentence doesn't get updated, so we want to clean that up before we bring back a final draft before the Board, if the Commission forwards a recommendation to go ahead and adopt. I just want to note that for the sake of the record.

Chair Mitchell: Do I have a motion for recommending to do that?

Commissioner Lohman: I recommend that – I make a motion that we recommend cleaning up the grammar and just sentence structure in general throughout the document.

Commissioner Martha Rose: Second.

Chair Mitchell: All right, I have a motion and second for staff to take care of that, so please do. Thank you so much.

Ms. Pratschner: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioners.

Chair Mitchell: Okay. Well, seeing as we have no other questions for them on this information on the documents, I guess we'll move right to the Department Update.

One more question – since we've finished this now, one more question for anybody else in the public. You have another shot for a public comment, should you want one.

Ms. Bynum: I'd like _____ part of it. It needs to come from *you*. I am reading this and _____ understand _____. _____ audience too.

Ms. Pratschner: Sure. Sure. So over this past year our Public Works Department has been working with the consultant groups, both ___ and BERK, about looking at a replacement for the Guemes Island Ferry. One of the proposals of that replacement is for it to be an all-electric ferry, as some of you may have heard Commissioner Dahlstedt describe that. It would be one of the first that you would see in Puget Sound. And so we did go through a SEPA comment period for those proposed updates, and at this point the Public Works Department is looking to secure some grant funding to help fund that replacement. Thank you for the question.

Chair Mitchell: Okay, does that spur any more questions for anybody else?

Commissioner Rose: Well, I do. I have one. So I was sort of looking at the chart of funds that are allocated for different things. I was looking at it on my computer screen. And I guess I'd like you to explain it a little bit. So in other words, what I noticed is that – and the thing I was looking at, just to pick out a topic, is the non-motorized vehicles. Or it was improvements that related to parks and trails.

Ms. Pratschner: Okay, okay.

Commissioner Rose: And it started out in the first column where there's an amount of money, and then there's a bunch of other columns, and so I didn't know if that money/those monies were to be spread out over those five years or those – or seven years or whatever that amount was, or if that was per year or – you know what I'm saying? Could you explain that?

Ms. Pratschner: Sure.

Commissioner Rose: Okay, here we are. It's on page 21. I think that's the one. Maybe it starts on – maybe it starts before that. Let's see. No, it's on 19. Look on page 19.

Ms. Pratschner: Okay.

Commissioner Rose: Oh no, that's the list. First of all, there's a list. It talks about acreage. And then following the list is the budget, and the budget starts on page 21. So – I don't know. Just pick a line and explain how what the numbers mean.

Ms. Pratschner: Sure. Let me go ahead and put this document up on the projector so –

Commissioner Rose: Okay.

Ms. Pratschner: So the Capital Facilities Plan, it includes two elements. There's the part that's the capital improvements program, which is the annual updates that we do for that six-year financing. And then you're looking at the more long-term view, which is that seven – up to the 20-year planning horizon for funding. So with the parks updates you have funding allocated for immediate needs but then you'll also have your parks comprehensive plan. They have their own comprehensive plan that covers those more long range 20-year planning horizon needs. Does that help?

Commissioner Rose: So if we look at, say, Northern State Recreation Area – just for picking one – you're saying that the first column that's mostly in red – is that the immediate funding? Is that what you're saying?

Ms. Pratschner: Yeah, so that date right there, the FY2019, indicates funding within that six-year window versus that longer planning horizon window.

Commissioner Rose: Oh, wait. So the amount of money in that first column will be spread out over about six years.

Ms. Pratschner: Yeah. Typically that's how we plan it, but then we also have our annual updates because things can –

Commissioner Rose: – change. That's what I imagine.

Ms. Pratschner: Yep, that number can very well change.

Commissioner Rose: I imagine that on some projects you might have a need that eats up most of it but then the need goes away for the next four or five years, right?

Ms. Pratschner: Exactly. Exactly.

Commissioner Rose: Okay, I get it. Okay. Okay. And then – all right, that’s – I think that answers my question.

Ms. Pratschner: Great question. Thank you.

Chair Mitchell: Does that bring to mind any other questions for anyone else?

(silence)

Chair Mitchell: Okay, seeing no other questions then, I’d like to close the public hearing. We’ll close the public hearing.

Ms. Pratschner: Are you going to make a motion?

Chair Mitchell: Yeah. I’d like to take a motion for closing the public hearing. Do I have a motion?

Commissioner Rose: I move that we close the public hearing.

Commissioner Mark Lundgren: I second it.

Chair Mitchell: Okay, we have moved and seconded. We’ll close the public hearing. Thank you. So the next item on the agenda is the Department Update, and I’m assuming that’ll be a combination between Stacie Pratschner –

Ms. Pratschner: That’s all right. We can just go ahead and go through the agenda. All right. Thank you again, Madame Chair. Yeah, we’ll go ahead and jump into the Department Updates.

So you had already mentioned the November 27th date where we’ll be holding deliberations then potentially creating that recorded motion that’ll be forwarded on to the Board of County Commissioners. Per a request from the Planning Commission at the last meeting, I have been in touch with Jurassic Parliament. They’re the group that gives training and updates on Robert’s Rules of Order, and they do have some availability after the new year closer to February. So the Director and I will keep working to schedule something so we can all have that necessary refresher.

Chair Mitchell: Thank you very much. That’ll be helpful.

Ms. Pratschner: You’re welcome. I did want to note again that the office will be closed for the Thanksgiving holiday. So upcoming on December 3rd starting at 10 a.m. that is going to be the beginning of the budget deliberations for the Board of County Commissioners. And we’ll also be presenting the recorded motion and doing deliberations for the Capital Facilities Plan and also the Transportation Improvement Program.

On December 19th, the Skagit Council of Governments Growth Management Steering Committee is going to meet and be discussing the 2019 work program for the technical advisory committee for SCOG.

December 14th is going to be the final day for my intern here and then December 31st for Nick. We have put a request in the budget for intern positions through the new year and so we'll keep you updated on how that proceeds with the budget updates.

Did the Director have any other updates to add?

Hal Hart: You're doing great.

Ms. Pratschner: Okay, great. Always happy to hear that. So I would like to just to take a couple of minutes. I know most of you have already met them individually but I wanted to formally introduce my two long range planning interns. We have Andrew Graminski and Nick Schmeck. They're both students in the urban planning program at Western Washington University. They started with me back in September and are giving incredible assistance in our department in research and the preparation of these documents, and just generally supporting the long range planning efforts for our department. So over the course of this time, in addition to them supporting me and me having them run around and doing sometimes the random things that come up in the day of a planner, they've also been working on two projects. The first project was something that came up for the Planning Commission last year and that was the issuance of a stormwater white paper. This is a document that would be a handy reference for anytime that we would be discussing stormwater updates, which I sincerely hope I am bringing back to you very early next year so we can get that in front of the Board and get that adopted. And then the second project is something that the Director has been having our interns work on, which is looking at some rural housing strategies.

So I'd like to go ahead and turn it over to Andrew and Nick and have them tell you about the work they've been doing.

Chair Mitchell: Thank you.

Ms. Pratschner: Thank you.

Andrew Graminski: Good evening, Commissioners. So I will speak on behalf of the stormwater white paper that me and Nick have been developing so far. As I call it, it's basically just a stormwater 101 for Skagit County. It's going to include all prudent information regarding stormwater management in Skagit County, including statutory basis for stormwater, low impact development, aquifer recharge areas, stormwater in agricultural lands, drainage and dike districts, tax assessments on drainage, dike – on zones and all related to stormwater. And it's going to be just a – like Stacie was saying – a very crucial resource for the county, for you guys, for the Board of County Commissioners, and then, of course, people living in Skagit County.

Nick Schmeck: Thank you, Andrew. Once again, thank you for having us here today. So I'm going to speak on the behalf of the housing white paper. It's actually been fairly exciting to work on this research project because, as you guys know, we are going through a housing crisis as we speak. There's a lack of affordable housing for all different kinds of people in the county. So basically Andrew and I and with the help of the Director and our long range manager Stacie, we are just doing an overview of, you know, the inventory, life expectancy of different types of housing, and we're specifically looking into some – as directed by the Director – looking into ADUs, what's

happening with single-family homes, possibly looking at manufactured homes as an affordable housing strategy. And then it's just a basic – something that you guys can use with research looking into the code, specifically we have even been looking into short subdivisions and comparing them to what other counties are doing. Right now our short subdivisions are four or less different parcels on a short subdivision and other counties are increasing theirs, and we are looking into the feasibility of doing that. So thank you.

Chair Mitchell: Wonderful. Thank you. We'll look forward to that.

Ms. Pratschner: Thank you both. I really appreciate it.

Chair Mitchell: Do any of the Planning Commission members have any questions?

Commissioner Rose: I have – I want to address both of you. First on the stormwater white paper. It's a request. Because I'm going through this right now so – and I Google. So City of Seattle has this interactive worksheet for stormwater where you can say – and this is for low impact development – and where you can say, Okay, here's how much impervious surface I have and I have this many trees on my site. And it'll help you. You can play with it until you, you know, come up with the – it's an Excel spreadsheet. You plug in certain things and you can see what happens. So in other words, Oh, if I plant three more trees then my infiltration basin can be smaller – or whatever. That type of thing. But so I know that's a little more sophisticated than probably what you were planning but if you even went as far as saying – you know, include in your 101 worksheet or whatever something along the lines of if your soils are, you know, medium granule or whatever – not clay – you could expect that a – you know, not make any absolutes but you could say like for 2000 square feet of impervious area you need this much volume. Like actually give some people – because when you're dealing with single houses, you cannot – it's not in the budget to hire an engineer. And most people, including myself – I mean, I'm good at math but I don't have all the tools in the toolkit to be able to do my own calculations and stuff. So it'd be nice to have a rule of thumb for – and maybe talk about the different – you know, if it's hardpan now you're talking this. Or if it's clay give it up and just do raingardens. Or whatever. But to actually go into some real specific help for homeowners or even builders who are building a home here and a home there. So that's on that.

And then on the –

Mr. Schmeck: Thank you.

Commissioner Rose: – housing thing, again, so I just finished – we're not quite done but we're wrapping up six units in downtown Sedro-Woolley and they're live/work. And so they don't have the tools in their toolbox, and I'm guessing Skagit County doesn't either, for what we called in Seattle "unilat subdivision." So unilat subdivision, you have a parent lot. You can develop it per the parent lot and then chop it up. And it's a very simple process and it doesn't require all the regular layers that a typical short plat requires. It's a way to get more density and do it more affordably. And the process I had to go through was a standard short plat process, and we went through it after the construction was 60% complete. But they still wanted us to go through all the – they did but they didn't. They still said, Well, these take nine months – or not nine months. They said three months, and, like, wait a minute. You don't have the stormwater review that was done with the building permit. You don't have the engineering review. That was done with the building permit. You don't have the fire department review. That was done with the building permit. So it shouldn't take the same amount of time. You see what I'm saying? So if you're really out to crack the affordability nut you're going to try to come up with some streamlined processes that can

produce more units. And when you build townhouses and then you have the ability to chop them up and – you know, through the party walls, that’s a more affordable housing type that works for a lot of people. So it’s not the be-all/end-all, but I just wanted to throw that out there.

Mr. Graminski and Mr. Schmeck: Thank you.

Commissioner Rose: And also one more little thing, and that is the live/work model is a really nice model *but* – there is a “but” here. It’s a nice model because somebody can come along and get a single-family homeowner loan for it, but – and the Building Code looks at it as a single-family item. So both the building department and the banks are onboard. But I believe that it would be useful for everybody if the County could build some flexibility in the way they interpret it. So the way it is now is if you’re the one that is living upstairs it has to be your business downstairs. That’s driven not so much by building code but it’s the land use code and the parking requirements. For example, my units are 1000 square feet of living space upstairs and about 700 of work space downstairs. If they weren’t live/work, I would have had to have four parking spots, but because they’re live/work, I only need two. Well, the parking requirements drive up the cost of housing tremendously. So I’m just suggesting that you really pay attention to that in your studying about how to create more housing more affordably.

Mr. Schmeck/Graminski: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Rose: Yeah.

Commissioner Josh Axthelm: Right _____ is that I work with a couple jurisdictions in Oregon, and then what they have is some incentives programs – is that if you do – let’s say, a multifamily, for example – is if you want multifamily to come in and you’re trying to attract it, offer a – not necessarily a discount in funds but a discount in review time. Say normally it takes us eight weeks. We’re going to knock that down to four weeks and put it as a priority. And that really helps with that incentive because it – and sometimes the fees come down, like there’s a tax incentive that’s there. So things like that.

Mr. Schmeck/Graminski: Thank you.

Mr. Hart: I’d like to just respond to what Martha said. We – at the City of Anchorage, we spent the last year-and-a-half working on unilot subdivision, and so there’s an example of – a larger city, but the idea was to get density in existing neighborhoods and to do it in a way that was – that the neighborhood would accept as well as to get housing units built as quickly as possible. And so we kind of had both those things and oftentimes cities are under that kind of pressure. But it would be interesting to understand where in the county would a unilot subdivision make sense. But I really enjoy you guys’ input as to what should be in our toolbox, so keep thinking like that. Anything you read let us know, or things that you think would work in this county. Because there are a lot of tools but some tools may work better than others or may require a lot of education before we get there. So I really appreciate that.

Chair Mitchell: Thank you. I appreciate that. Any other questions or comments for the interns?

Commissioner Rose: I have one more but it’s not related. It’s follow-up, though, from last year. Western Washington was working on a template for rainwater harvesting, and I would like to know what the status of that is.

Mr. Hart: I believe where it is right now is we need to get the players in the room one last time to look at that. So I think the last time we were looking at that was July or early August and I think it's time to determine where we were going to go. And it's just – we'll get to it, but I'm not sure if we have a – I think that was right. Yeah, it's on the docket.

Commissioner Lundsten: For Guemes, right?

Commissioner Rose: Well, for everywhere but –

Commissioner Lundsten: I thought Guemes had a specific proposal for their area for catchment.

Ms. Pratschner: Yeah, that's correct. And part of their request is that the County adopt a prescriptive design similar to what ___ helped us with with rainwater catchment when we were doing the Western Sustainable Communities Partnership. But, yeah, that is limited to Guemes and so, yeah, I'll defer about rainwater catchment in other parts of the county to the Director.

Commissioner Rose: And I'm hoping that this Commission has an opportunity to review the proposal – the final proposal – because I remember reviewing the preliminary one. And I corresponded with the gentleman that produced it, and there were a couple things in there that I felt were just not right. You know what I'm saying? Like, I've studied this a lot and I – so it would just be nice if we had a chance to review it.

Mr. Hart: Okay.

Ms. Pratschner: Yeah, the Board will – when we go to public hearing with the Board, they'll be making that decision on whether to docket that and whether it comes in front of the Planning Commission for consideration.

Chair Mitchell: Anybody – okay, Mark, go ahead.

Commissioner Lundsten: I just have one pretty general comment, kind of following up on this. I'm currently in the – I just started getting a permit approved to add an 8 by 12-foot pad onto a Group B well pump house on a water system that's on my property and the water goes to our three neighbors and ourselves. It's really small. It's not a big construction project. And I would have appreciated – and I've rebuilt the house in Seattle and there have been very – it was pretty good experiences with the permits there and then one particular part of it was really rugged, so I've had it both ways. But one thing I noticed about this small job is I really could have used a threshold – clarity about the threshold: When do you need the permit? What do we have – when do I get to the point where I've got to go see the County? And it wasn't clear, so I came to see the County to find out and then it wasn't clear until we talked to about two or three different people. So just if that was clarified for the sake of the public I think it would save everyone. And people would just feel that much more welcome coming in the door.

Ms. Pratschner: Thank you.

Commissioner Lundsten: As it was, I'm – I was treated very well, very expeditiously. In fact, someone said one thing during the interview and then I got home and there was a phone message that said, We looked that up. We were wrong. We found this other thing. Here's the correct information. So I would – you know, it's been – it was great service. So I'm not – this is not a complaint. This is just a suggestion for facility of getting into the system.

Ms. Pratschner: Thank you.

Chair Mitchell: And because this is something we're looking at countywide – that's what the Board of County Commissioners indicated just recently – who are all the players that are necessary on something countywide for rain catchment?

Mr. Hart: Oh, for rain catchment. Well, there's going to be a lot of players on something like that, but certainly there's the County. And then my understanding would be there'd be engineers that have experience here and designers that would have experience, so I would definitely tap into that. The question would be what other agencies are already doing that work or in that. So you probably have to look at the list of agencies, but I'm thinking the Department of Health –

Chair Mitchell: Sure.

Ms. Pratschner: What about Ecology?

Mr. Hart: Yeah, for sure.

Chair Mitchell: So I think it can be a pretty big deal.

Ms. Pratschner: Our local tribes.

Mr. Hart: Of course. Right. So it's – but part of me just says, Oh, it's all the usual, you know, ____, but what we're trying to do is be innovative, too, right? So we're pushing that envelope a little bit. Yeah. I mean, it's a great question. I would just – you would put it out there generally that we're working on this and then get everybody to contribute.

Chair Mitchell: Right. Well, it seems like it would be a simple question at first blush for the uninitiated.

Mr. Hart: Anything to do with water's going to be –

Chair Mitchell: Right. There it goes because it gets really big. And I can't help but think that there are plenty of other places that have done something like this already. Wouldn't there be?

Mr. Hart: We haven't found that to actually be.

Chair Mitchell: Wow, so we'd be pioneering.

Mr. Hart: In certain ways we are definitely pioneering. Yeah.

Chair Mitchell: Well, we really appreciate you guys checking into it.

Mr. Hart: Thank you.

Ms. Pratschner: Thank you.

Commissioner Rose: The only other – I'll respond – the only other – I've heard of templates for rainwater catchment when it's not for potable water. So there have been some templates that way. But this is for potable. This is for everything. And I think once you come up with this template it'll get adopted by other jurisdictions. Don't you think?

Mr. Hart: If it is legal, yes.

Commissioner Rose: Well, it should be because – so Bellingham has issued a couple for rainwater catchment. When the ban on the wells – you know, before the *Hirst* decision got fixed? There's a water engineer up there. I forget his name, but he's a young guy, and he came to talk to us and said, We got two permits issued during this period of time and so.... No, there's a lot of people that do it.

Mr. Hart: Right. I'll just say the law is a living – it's a living thing, and so – and evolving. So we're hearing from lots of people right now on these issues.

Chair Mitchell: Good. Thank you. I can't help but think it's very important to a lot of folks across the county.

Mr. Hart: It's super important. And you're going to hear more in the next few months.

Chair Mitchell: Okay, great. Thank you. Anybody else have any other questions, comments?

(silence)

Chair Mitchell: Okay. Then let's move on to the next agenda item, Planning Commissioner Comments. Anything from anybody ___ we need to know about?

(silence)

Chair Mitchell: Okay. Seeing none, then I'll ask for a motion to adjourn if you guys are inclined.

Commissioner Axthelm: I motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Lundsten: I was actually – I should speak up. I haven't done it yet but as long as – I won't be here next week so I – pardon me for interrupting, Josh. I was just going to file a basic minority report on the last docket stuff and – just to let people know. I won't be here but I'll be sending it to the Board and I'm sure you'll get a copy. Just for your information. So that's news from the Planning Commission, I suppose.

Chair Mitchell: Thank you.

Commissioner Lundsten: Not surprising news, I suppose, either.

Commissioner Axthelm: So I'll motion to adjourn.

Chair Mitchell: So I have a second?

Commissioner Lundsten: Second.

Chair Mitchell: Therefore we have a first and second for a motion to adjourn. We are adjourned (gavel).