

**COMMISSIONERS MINUTES OF SPECIAL SESSION / JOINT WORKSHOP WITH PLANNING  
COMMISSION - FEBRUARY 11, 1998**

The Board of Island County Commissioners met in joint Special Session on February 11, 1998,

with the Island County Planning Commission, beginning t 9:30 a.m., in Hearing Room 1, Island County Courthouse Annex, Coupeville, Wa. The purpose of the Special Session was to conduct a joint workshop for the Board to meet with the Planning Commission, Planning Director, Hearing Examiner, Planning/Legal Consultant an staff, to discuss issues related to the GMA Comp Plan and Development Regulations. The workshop agenda included: Existing Zoning Regulations, Informal Policies, PRD & Site Plan Ordinances, Enforcement.

**ATTENDANCE**

**Board of County Commissioners:** Wm. L. McDowell, Chairman; Mike Shelton, Member; Tom Shaughnessy, Member

**Hearing Examiner:** Michael Bobbink

**Planning Commission:** Rufus Rose, Chairman; Linda Moore, Member; Anne Pringle; Member; Bill Vincent, Member and Sheilah Crider, Member

**Consultant:** Keith W. Dearborn

**Staff:** Vince Moore, Planning Director; Donna Keeler, Manager, Comprehensive Planning; Jeff Tate, Assistant Planner; Debra Little, Development Services Manager; Stacy Tucker, Assistant Planner; Erika Jensen, Senior Planner; Kris Morrison, Associate Planner/ Shoreline; Phil Bakke, Enforcement and Pam Dill, Hearing Examiner's Office.

**Public:** Approximately 10 people were in the audience; 7 signed the attendance sheet.

[Attendance Sheet on file]

**Existing Zoning Regulations**

Debra Little cited the biggest problem Planning staff has with the existing code to be interpretation of uses, the question "is the use allowed in this zone?" or "we know the use is allowed but it requires a site plan". Some specifics Ms. Little noted:

1. Agricultural Uses - What is allowed in other than the Agricultural zone? What level of

commercial retail activity is allowed as part of an agricultural use in any zone?

a. Lavender Farm in the RR zone: grow the lavender, then build a barn to store and distill the lavender, send lavender away to be processed into products such as, soaps and oils; receive the lavender products for sale on site, then add a gift shop in the barn with a whole line of gift baskets and other products to sell on-site and through a catalog. No residence on-site to be able to define this as a home industry.

b. Farmers Markets: a temporary but reoccurring retail sale use that does not include a residence, which if successful, can have significant associated traffic. Under what conditions and in what zone should it be allowed?

c. Farm and forest products stands.

d. Greenhouses: allowed as an accessory to a residence, and could then sell home grown products as a home occupation, with up to 2 employees as a home industry. Where should successful full service greenhouses be

located?

e. Stables: offer private lessons; start having exhibition and competition events on weekends, and start allowing camping by participants in the events on site.

2. Dwelling Units. Second residences must meet density requirements; however, guest houses (not allowed in the R zone) do not need to meet density but are defined as primary dwellings and are often built to be about the same or greater size as the primary residence. Need to redefine a guest house as accessory, provide criteria, but not require a site plan. Consider defining "accessory dwellings" as secondary in size and use [as for a parent or children].

3. When are accessory uses really accessory and when are they permitted?

3. Temporary Uses. Very narrowly defined; ordinance limits temporary uses to those listed.

Revise so that reoccurring events only need one review; specify what needs to be shown and create a quick turn-around review time.

5. Institutional Uses. Some uses are allowed in all zones; some are not allowed in AG and FM zones. The definition includes "provides a public service" but another part of the code lists many uses that are not necessarily provided by government or non-profits, such as medical and dental offices. Some of these uses may be appropriate and have little impact when located along a State Highway but can be disruptive off of a private road.

a. Utilities. A changing category of uses such as water tanks, community drainfields, electric substation, and cell towers. One request received was to build a cable TV station and offices on the same RR zoned parcel with the cell tower. In that case, staff denied in that it did not meet intent of the institutional use. Appeal was filed but withdrawn before it was heard.

b. Recreational Facilities. Not defined and can include many uses. County and State parks are allowed, but what about golf courses with driving ranges and club houses, with a restaurant and bar? Indoor private soccer fields? Health clubs?

c. Churches. The traditional sanctuary with church offices now may include a multi-purpose hall, classrooms, day care, counseling offices, other medical offices, or a book store.

d. Hospitals, Medical/Dental Clinics and Offices. Recent proposal for a general professional office complex to be rented to doctors and dentists in the RR zone.

6. Home Businesses from the small home occupation to the successful home industry.

a. Kennels as a home industry in the RR zone. There was a proposal for a maximum of 40

dogs in one kennel.

b. Construction businesses involving large trucks and the employees that come on site to pick up the trucks. Use of an accessory structure built without a permitted use on site to operate from.

c. Auto Repair in the R or RR zones. Associated cars left for repair, cars left and used for parts - the outside garage.

d. Weddings. Associated traffic and parking, outside business people coming on site - florists, caterers, musicians, rental equipment people.

e. B & Bs. Defined and limited in the R and RR zones. Newest request is to use the B&B for weekend weddings, for small or large parties. Involves more people on site than those who stay at the B&B - associated traffic and parking, outside business people coming on site - florists, caterers, musicians, rental equipment people.

Ms. Little explained that all conditional uses are approved through a site plan review. Most of the criteria used to decide whether the use should be allowed, after looking at the actual zone, is listed in ICC 16.15.040, and is the same criteria used for a guest house, cell tower, or a major shopping center. The criteria is somewhat general and staff often make assumptions that uses will be compatible and a reasonable transition will be provided with a landscaping buffer, but then landscaping is either not planted, dies or is deliberately removed. The Site Plan Review code lists applicability and at times conflicts with the zoning code. The zoning code stipulates that for conditional uses site plan review is required; the applicability section requires a site plan for 1,000 square feet or more: "what do you do with the 5 acre car lot with no buildings on it?". Staff would like to have those types of problems between the codes revised. Site plan review criteria becomes very difficult when someone wants to do a subdivision of commercial property. Staff would like to see a PRD defined as a subdivision rather than a zoning change.

As far as problems encountered with the land use review process, Ms. Little felt that the regulations should be changed to address the question: "what is a complete application, when is it accepted, and the timeline needed to review it?". Public notice section needs to be revised with clarification when a process is a one step process or the two step preliminary final. There is also the need for clarification of when a building permit can be obtained - after preliminary or final. There is some question about when someone needs to show they have water and areas for drainfields or are hooking into a sewer system for their project. Generally it is a condition of preliminary.

There were other problems noted too by Vince Moore, such as the issue of waterfront setbacks and how those are administered and the interrelationship of the SMA with the setback requirements in the zoning code. The application of moratoriums, when they should take place and when they should be lifted. Non-conforming uses needs more precise terminology. Use of wetland buffers - when can they be crossed by utility lines, driveways and roadways. Also questions involving subdivision of lands containing wetlands. A performance based code is good if you have continuity of staff, institutional memory, and a build up of good policy in terms of when certain things should and should not be applied. The general feeling expressed by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners a few years ago was that we should move back from that type of an ordinance to an ordinance with more standards.

In regard to the lavender farm business, the kind of site characteristics that make that use appropriate in one place and inappropriate in another were addressed by Ms. Little - based on just the characteristics of the use staff looks at access (state highway or county arterial), size of the parcel, location of the activity on the parcel, number of employees, number of customers, and if there was going to be a large event public facilities needed. Mr. Moore added that there is also the issue of seasonal or night operations.

The Chair expressed an interest in discussion of the concept of Euclidean versus performance based standards.

Linda Moore asked about how much of the problem was with the Code and how much related to education of the public.

Commissioner Shelton felt that the general public coming to the permit counter without assistance of a professional, probably go away frustrated because with performance based zoning, Planners cannot give the answers.

What Mr. Dearborn observed, which has to be a high level of staff frustration, is that there is virtually no record keeping in the County to indicate why a decision was made and the rationale behind it. To have a performance based system with staff discretion, there needs to be continuity of staff that allows that judgment to build up in terms of the series of decisions that are retrievable.

Chairman McDowell suggested written policies bought off by the legislators annually.

Other counties, Mr. Dearborn noted, rely on the Hearing Examiner who on a periodic basis reports on where there are problems with the code and where changes need to be made. He did not feel that the county staff had the benefit of the kind of continuity that is needed to make a performance system work.

Ms. Little said that the hardest part was trying to figure out what is or is not allowed – what is the basic core assumption, the vision to be working with that the standards apply to. Training is on-the-job and on a case by case basis and there is no outside training. Training is needed as far as what has been established in the County. As far as whether less flexibility in the code would be a solution to the problems, Ms. Little answered no, and cited as an example the lavender farm -- making that less flexible would not allow that in the location proposed. Needed are better performance criteria actually related to the reality of the site: where is the site located, what is adjacent to it, what other uses could be impacted, what are the impacts, if there are impacts can they be mitigated.

Mr. Dearborn suggested that if the County could not rely on continuity of decisions as well as knowledge, then would need to go to a more standard based code.

Mrs. Crider agreed there seemed to be no predictability and that the general public needed needs clarification and certainty, what is allowed, what is required to get there, and who makes the final determination.

Mr. Bobbink suggested the first step is to decide on the desired code - a code that is more predictable or more open ended; a lot of problems might be solved by having a more standard type of code with black and white answers. His experience is that people push the envelope on flexible alternatives given. There are cases too where a project can be conditioned, but then conditions not complied with.

Commissioner Shelton believed everyone agreed there is no need to write a new code; what is needed is to address the problem issues and get on with it. Commissioner Shaughnessy concurred, noting that Mr. Dearborn had not been brought in to recreate the wheel - address the issues and move on.

Mr. Dearborn observed that clearly, the level of concern by the public is over the inability to come to the permit counter and get answers. Adding standards to the code based on the kinds of comments and concerns that Ms. Little raised would not be that hard of a challenge. He agreed to meet with Mr. Bobbink and Ms. Little next week to address the issues raised.

### **Enforcement ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

Phil Bakke said that the easier it is for him to enforce the code the easier it is for the public to understand it. Currently he handles enforcement for short plats, site plan reviews, shoreline management issues, shoreline code, zoning ordinance, and building codes. If someone commits an act in violation of the shoreline code, that is processed through the Hearing Examiner which requires staff to come up with affidavits and arrange a meeting with the Hearing Examiner. An appeal would be heard before the Shoreline Management Hearing Board. He suggested the County give that authority to the Planning Director rather than the Hearing Examiner under the enforcement provisions of ICC

17.02, which would help build some predictability, and the appeal could go to the Hearing Examiner. It is easier for him to work with the Planning Director available five days a week than it is to arrange a meeting with the Hearing Examiner available here only twice a month.

Mr. Bakke believed the same sort of issue applied to enforcement of site plan reviews. One of the issues brought up by the Hearing Examiner in regard to conditions of the site plan not being followed. There is no civil process the Department can take to deal with those issues. The method for enforcement is through the Prosecuting Attorney who really does not have time to deal with the person who lets landscaping die. It would be easier and more effective to allow the Planning Director the authority to take these first steps to enforce site plan review conditions. The most common complaint he receives relate to neighbors collecting junk cars. In some counties the sheriff's office deals with that issue; in others a combination is used working with the sheriff's office and the planning department. Island County handles the issue of junk cars by concluding that the collection of the junk cars is constitutes a junk or salvage yard; there is no guidance in the code as to how many junk cars constitute a junk or salvage yard. Another area Mr. Bakke would recommend being reviewed is the "right of access", ICC 17.02.250A.

### **Business Activities in Rural Lands - PRELIMINARY DRAFT**

John Hitt presented the report, a follow up to their previous report "Business Land Use Needs for Island County to the Year 2016". The follow up was conducted in light of recent amendments to the GMA contained in ESB 6094, as well as updated county population and employment forecasts. A committee was put together consisting of EDC members, representatives of the Growth Management Coalition and County home-based/ tourist- based businesses.

The committee agreed that Home Occupations should be allowed in all zones, have the look and feel of a residential use from the outside while allowing extensive interior modifications and use of up to the greater of 600 square feet or 50% of interior space for business purposes and allow one unrelated employee. Home Industries should be viewed in the light of impacts on neighbors rather than the specific occupation or activity, and could include accessory building uses and allow up to 5 non-related employees. A site plan review would assure that the home industry was compatible with the rural environment.

Tourist based lodging facilities fall into three categories:

1. Small B & B's, (1 to 2) rooms, allowed in any zone with no exterior modifications or accessory buildings;
2. B & B Inns (3 to 12 rooms, allowed in the Rural Residential zone or mixed use RAIDs, allow some accessory building use, require a site plan; and
3. Country Inns, (13-35 rooms) allowed in mixed use RAIDs, Rural Residential and shoreline zones with a site plan review. Due to their intensive uses, it is recommended they be limited to sites of 10 acres or more.

The intensification of development on lots containing isolated non-residential uses, or the new development of isolated cottage industries and isolated small-scale business should be allowed in all rural land zones, with an established logical outer boundary, since these uses provide job opportunities for rural residents. Principal structures for these businesses probably should not exceed 5,000 square feet in order to meet the small scale test.

Commissioner Shelton questioned having small retail/service businesses in all zones. Vince Moore indicated if those are inside an established logical outer boundary, then it is inside a RAID and cannot be permitted in all zones. Mr. Dearborn noted that the small retail/service businesses category would have to fit into the home industry category to make it work.

### **Public Input**

**Lenny Edgeman, Freeland.** Historically the NR Floating Zone has an administrative guideline to be 50% impervious, and if enforced could cut in half the available property. Starting out with 100% impervious less the specific requirements of design and allow it to fall in that manner, instead of a 50% arbitrary number, it will help use the land in the most effective way in the future.

**Frank Milkowski**. Need to make the code clear so everybody can understand it. Also talked about being able to expand the uses on properties currently zoned commercial. properties

**Bill Thorn, Citizens Growth Management Coalition**. Suggested that the County consider

civilian support for code enforcement. It was his observation that fines and liens do not work, even substantial ones, because it becomes the cost of doing business. In most cases he thought a stop work order necessary in order to get someone's attention; if they do not respond, then

seriously look at making it a criminal offense.

**John Graham, Citizens Growth Management Coalition**. Felt the EDC report was a good product and he endorsed it. Intensification of development on lots containing isolated NR uses, or the new development of isolated cottage industries and isolated non-residential uses, or the new development of isolated cottage industries and isolated small-scale business should be allowed in all rural land zones, since these uses provide job opportunities for rural residents. Principal structures for these businesses probably should not exceed 5,000 square feet in order to meet the small scale test, i.e. businesses such as the Greenbank Store and Bailey's Corner.

The Chairman asked if the Coalition endorsed the EDC report.

John Graham indicated he was empowered by the Coalition to negotiate with EDC to get the best result possible. The Coalition operates by consensus, but every member is free to break with the Coalition; the Coalition does not control individual members.

Mr. Dearborn pointed out the ability to create a category beyond home industry called "small scale business or cottage industry" and could site new small scale businesses in the County;

scope, type and scale are all questions that need to be addressed. The discussion sounds like places that for the most part have access to arterials and are not in the middle of an intense residential area.

In Mr. Graham's view, the logical outer boundaries section put in a lot of constraints. Mr. Moore stated that the logical outer boundaries only apply to RAIDS. But Mr. Graham mention-ed that these areas would become RAIDS. Mr. Moore pointed out that RAIDS have to pre-exist, but Mr. Graham disagreed, citing amendments to ESB 6094.

Commissioner Shelton thought it not to be a huge issue on South Whidbey - many of the neighborhood type of stores no longer exist and there has to be an economic reason for that.

John Graham commented on the enforcement issue that mistrust would disappear if citizens throughout the county felt that there was tight and mandatory enforcement and all the resources needed were available. Having Phil Bakke on board he thought was a huge step up.

**Richard Collins**. Presented a workbook on types of tourist lodging. According to a recent Langley Special Advertising section in Seattle Magazine, overnight visitors to South Whidbey have a range of choices. At last count close to 200 rooms were available on South Whidbey Island. Adding the Inns, Cottages and B&Bs, including the 32 room Captain Whidbey Inn, in Central Whidbey, comes to a total of about 300 rooms. He thought it would be almost impossible to replicate the Captain Whidbey Inn and make it financially viable. Captain Whidbey operates at 75 % capacity, and feel they are below capacity because people do not seem to know about empty space there. A 1994 survey showed that B&Bs and Inns on Whidbey Island operate on an annual occupancy of 40% capacity. To emphasis and stress the development of a lot of traditional B&Bs may take some people down the wrong path because the market may not be there. A Master Planned Resort is an entirely different market from B & Bs. To really compete with current B&Bs and Inns, means development of more Captain Whidbey or smaller, or larger, facilities. The market he thought would be for a larger facility.

Economics decide scale, and the County should not arbitrarily set a scale. Determination of room capacity for Master Planner Resorts cannot be pre-set as a generalized number. Each property and project will have complex calculations

and requirements and should be evaluated on its own merits during the permitting process. Development of inns with only 25 rooms cannot attract or handle major conference business. Such inns can not afford to develop infrastructure, recreational amenities and extensive buffers/surroundings. He thought that Island County was overlooking the whole area of tourism and lodging as a source to develop a very substantial amount of tax revenue.

**Tom Roehl, Greenbank.** Understood Ms. Little's frustration with some parts of the code but did not think going to a Euclidean type system would work because the issues do not lend themselves to mathematical quantification. With respect to enforcement, he reminded of the importance of civil rights in the process. Need to keep a separation between the Hearing Examiner and the Planning Department. The Planning Director should not be both the prosecutor and the judge; the judge should be the Hearing Examiner. In the organizational chart the Hearing Examiner secretary is listed under the Planning Director and that should not be the case. He suggested exploring the use of a citation system for enforcement similar to what some of the state agencies use. The civil process is not always more expedient; in some violations it is more expedient to go right to district court and get it solved by a judge. He did not think inspection rules should be changed unless the system is changed to be more like the court system.

He suggested that one of the solutions for home industries that grow beyond scope would be to make it very clear in conditions of project approval that the approval is for a limited scope of operation and exceeding that scope of operation could result in the removal of the approval.

**Workshop Recess: 1:00- 2:00 p.m.**

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

The Chairman announced that the Board would meet in Executive Session beginning at 2:00 p.m., for purposes as allowed under RCW 42.30.110(1)(i) to discuss with legal counsel pending or potential litigation. The Executive Session lasted for 35 minutes and on return to open public session at 2:35 p.m., no announcement was made or action taken.

### **UPDATED AND REVISED GMA COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE**

Mr. Dearborn presented a revised GMA Compliance Schedule and briefly reviewed changes. On the evening of March 9<sup>th</sup> will be a joint Board and Planning Commission presentation of the Draft Plan, DEIS, and Draft Development Regulations. The presentation will explain how the Plan responds to tentative decisions the Board made based on the recommendations of the Planning Commission. Six community open houses are scheduled for areas of Oak Harbor, Camano Island, Central Whidbey and South Whidbey, and will be staffed by members of the Planning Commission and Planning staff. Citizens will be able to ask general questions about the Plan, or specific questions in regard to individual properties. The public hearing process should be completed by the end of March, with the deliberation period in April. Two joint Board and Planning Commission workshops are proposed to collectively review issues raised; the Planning Commission will then hold meetings to finalize Findings and Recommendations. The last two weeks of the month, the Board will finalize the Plan and Development Regulations.

By unanimous motion, the Board adopted the new compliance schedule.

### **Staff presentation of PRD Ordinance**

Erika Jensen noted that staff looked at four PRDs on South Whidbey: Anderson Road (Talking Circle); Woodlands; Wilkenson Trace; and Passage View Estates; and looked at some of the questions the code poses in terms of how the PRD ordinance is working and some of the reasons people do PRDs versus a long plats.

**Pat Murphy, Anderson Road PRD.** Talking Circle is a co-housing development with a total of 20 acres, 8 clustered lots, common house and garden – a 20 acre piece of land bought about 9 years ago just outside of Langley. Co-housing was new to both the Talking Circle residents and the planning staff.

Mr. Dearborn asked if they thought anything the County required had been unreasonable. Mr. Murphy replied no, it all turned out for their benefit even if they had not appreciated it at the time.

**Kim Hoelting, Woodlands PRD.** Woodlands PRD consists of 20 acres, and bought 4 TDRs - went with 10 units. He did not think either he or Mr. Murphy were representative of the typical developer, in that they both have very real and deep connections with the land they developed. His dealings with the County were magnificent, staff helped, were cheerful and when wedged in by regulations that did not seem to apply, tried to make it work. The pain and agony came from years and years of waiting for water, which is a State issue. He believed deeply in the PRD concept and thought it should be continued.

Mr. Dearborn commented that what the Board and Planning Commission were tentatively proposing was this: example - 20 acres, at 1du/5acres - would have 4 units, if you preserved open space or protected critical areas, could get 2 more units for a total of 6 units. If the development offered affordable housing, could get an additional bonus. His question to Mr. Hoelting was: if his project could only have 6 units would he have been able to do it?

Mr. Hoelting replied that he could not have afforded it if that had been the case. Mr. Murphy also indicated the same.

**Randy Crosby.** Started a 26 lot development in Island County about 5 1/2 years ago "Skatchet Hills" now "Cottage Glen". This was his first development project and it seemed to him to take a lifetime – two years of fighting with the Skatchet Head Water District Commissioners and the State to get water, and another three years dealing with the County – each time told they had to do something else; every time they had a question it took another 60 days. In the City of Everett for an 8 lot short plat and a 9 lot short plat, it took 14 months from the beginning to end.

Linda Moore wondered if the difference was because of the availability of infrastructure or in the way the County processed the applications. Mr. Crosby said that the problem was always having to go back to the drawing board every time they came in with a question.

Mr. Dearborn asked Mr. Crosby the question: if you had a 20 acre tract on South Whidbey could he do a PRD with two extra units and make it work? Mr. Crosby did not think it would be possible.

Commissioner Shelton thought it useless to talk about anything beyond 6 hookups because that requires a water right which takes at least 5 to 7 years from the State.

Mr. Hoelting felt it would take a lot of stress off the County and developers to require a water right before even bringing in a PRD proposal.

Erika Jensen gave three reasons why developers might choose PRDs over long plats: significant natural features on the site; lot sizes that are less than five acres in size; and more houses than the standard zoning will allow. Basically the same criteria applies for reviewing a long plat as it does for a PRD; the difference is that for a long plat there is not the open space and recreation area requirements. In reviewing the four PRDs, she looked at total acreage, number of lots, average density, average lot square foot size, open space required per the code open space actually put in, road width, and road surface.

Mr. Dearborn pointed out that all four PRDs are in densities that are substantially greater than what the Planning Commission has recommended and the Board has tentatively approved. He asked if there had been any problem with the projects directly related to density.

Erika Jensen said that because of the way they have been designed she did not see any problems with the densities. Stacy Tucker stated that because of the steep slopes, Passage View PRD became more of a concern.

Mr. Dearborn stated that from today's testimony, it was apparent that the density of 50% bonus was not sufficient to do a PRD and or to get to affordable housing. He asked staff what else they needed to do for a fair evaluation of the PRD process.

Erika Jensen mentioned the need to look at the bigger PRDs and Ms. Tucker said they needed to do some comparisons

with standard platting vs. PRDs.

### **OWNER/BUILDER ISSUES**

Bob McCaughan discussed whether the owner/builder lends itself to affordable housing. He provided a list of all the owner/builder houses in the last 5 years in order of size, and noted the average time, supplied by the National Builders Association, for a person to build a 2,000 square foot home is 5.6 months. Of the first 5 on the list, only one was finalized, a 4,000 square foot home that took only 6 months to build. Only 23% of owner/builder homes have been finalized. Over the last 5 years (using Self -Help Housing criteria) of single family residences 1200 square feet and less only 0.88% (not including mobiles/manufactured homes) in Island County were in the affordable housing range.

Assuming that the plan would include a policy that reinforces and encourages use of owner/builder homes, Mr. Dearborn cautioned that would not necessarily get low income affordability, but did allow people to get homes at a price and value closer to what they may be able to afford.

Commissioner Shelton pointed out that the owner/builder allows a person to build a home that they otherwise may not be able to afford. He thought the big issue with the owner/builder permit is the length of time it allows people to live in a tent trailer while they are building their home.

Rufus Rose made the point that the Assessor makes the assumption that a house is completed within a year after the building permit is issued and starts assessing it on that basis unless they are told otherwise; if told otherwise, with a conventional permit, it would have to be renewed.

### **Population Projections**

Commissioner Shelton explained the reason the Board went with the high OFM population figure was because that is where the County is now. In terms of the LOS on transportation infrastructure, over which Island County has no control, the State indicated the County does not have to include LOS on State infrastructure because there is not the ability to fix it. If the State infrastructure truly becomes a limiting growth factor in Island County then Island County has committed to bench mark it in five years. There will be 5 years worth of statistical data to show whether the population is going to continue to grow at this rate or if it is going to level off, and if so, he would be perfectly willing to go back and reallocate the population figures at the medium range.

Mr. Dearborn indicated the reason the Planning Commission was not unanimous in using the high allocation was because he had urged them not to – he was working under the impression that it was going to mean a lot more work for staff because they had already started the medium range projection. However, the Board learned Monday from Public Works staff that it really did not make any difference at this point because the Capital Facility Plan is on the high range already.

Workshop adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

## **BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**

### **ISLAND COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

---

Wm. L. McDowell, Chairman

---

Tom Shaughnessy, Member

---

Mike Shelton, Member

**Attest:** \_\_\_\_\_

Margaret Rosenkranz, Clerk of the Board