

**ISLAND COUNTY COMMISSIONERS - MINUTES OF SPECIAL SESSION &****JOINT SPECIAL SESSION WITH ISLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MARCH 26, 1998**

The Board of Island County Commissioners met in Special Session on March 26, 1998, beginning at 5:00 p.m. at Terry's Corner Fire Station, 525 E. North Camano Drive, Camano Island, Wa. Wm. L. McDowell, Chairman; Tom Shaughnessy, Member; and Mike Shelton, Member, were present. Also present were Joe Araucto, Island County Traffic Engineer; Dick Snyder, Island County Construction Engineer; and Joyce Kasperson, Adm. Asst. Approximately 35 citizens were present. The purpose of the Special was to conduct a Public Hearing on Ordinance #C-11-98, speed limits, and a Public Hearing on the Draft GMA Comp Plan and Development Regulations.

The Board, by unanimous motion, designated Joyce Kasperson to serve as alternate Clerk of the Board during this Special Session to act in the absence of Margaret Rosenkantz, the Appointed Clerk of the Board.

**HEARING HELD: ORDINANCE #C-11-98 (R-5-98) REGULATING SPEED LIMITS ON CAMANO ISLAND ROADS & AMENDING ICC TITLE X, CHAPTER 10.01**

Chairman McDowell opened a Public Hearing to consider Ordinance #C-11-98 (R-5-98) in the matter of regulating speed limits on Camano Island Roads, shown on Exhibit 'A' of the Ordinance, and amending Island County Code, Title X, Chapter 10.01.

Joe Araucto, Island County Traffic Engineer, explained the procedure used to determine the proposed changes to the speed limits. He stated traffic studies were done to measure 85<sup>th</sup>- percentile speed, pace speed, and other factors regarding safety such as sight distance, and accidents. He explained the proposed speed limit reductions and indicated Lowell Point Road would be included in the next Public Hearing.

Chairman McDowell opened the Public Hearing by road name.

**Sunrise Blvd. from SR 532 to North Camano Drive proposed reduction from 50 mph to 35 mph.**

Jerry Albers, 1837 S. East Camano Dr., was not in favor of the speed limit reduction and asked why it was proposed to reduce it 15 mph. He felt accident rates should be directly related to speeding.

Becky Albers, 1837 S. East Camano Dr., commented that people were already driving safely according to the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile and asked why must the speed limit be reduced.

Joe Araucto pointed out it's difficult to drive much faster than 35 mph in the short distance between the stop signs. He stated the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile was 39 to 43 mph, and the pace speed was 30 to 40 mph. He said the average accident rate in Island County has been set at 2.0 and anything above that is considered to be high. Considering all the factors, it was his recommendation to reduce the speed limit to 35 mph.

**Arrowhead Road, 700 Feet South of Chick Road to North Camano Drive proposed reduction from 50 mph to 35 mph**

Robert Both, 508 W. Maple Grove Road, felt the speed limit should be lowered further south on Arrowhead Road than the recommended 700 feet because of the sight distance.

Commissioner Shaughnessy commented in order to extend the proposed speed limit of 35 mph it would have to be advertised again.

Paul Turner, 1409 S. Rainbow Lane, felt the proposed reduction in speed limits looked like a patchwork job and felt more study needed to be done or more Public Hearings held before considering the Ordinance.

**North Camano Drive/West Camano Drive from Brokaw Road to Sunset Blvd. proposed reduction from 50 mph**

**to 35 mph**

Robert Both was in favor of reducing the speed limit on North Camano Drive from Utsalady to West Camano Drive rather than just the around the curve that was proposed.

Jack Dorsey, 2772 S. East Camano Drive, commented that accident rates cannot be proven by speed but are caused by people who disregard speed limits. He was in favor of reducing speed around curves.

Jerry Albers relayed that a neighbor was concerned about reducing speed limits because they commute to Seattle and felt their commute would be slower and slower because of the reduction in speed limits. He suggested that arterial roads with 50 mph speed limits be established to facilitate the commuters.

Juan Gumataotao, 2805 N. Wood Road, Oak Harbor commented that he did obey the speed limit and felt there were others like him and maybe the lower speed limit would save lives.

Compton Winspear, 1958 S. East Camano Drive, believed the commute time would not be affected by the reduction in speed limits. He said the higher speed limits were not worth the safety factor.

Detective Legasse, Island County Sheriff's Office, agreed that a reduction in speed limit was warranted because many of the accidents that occur in the 35 mph zone on North Camano Drive actually started in the 50 mph zone. When approaching the 35 mph zone people apply the brakes and hit ice resulting in an accident.

**Dallman Road, East Camano Drive to West Camano Drive proposed reduction from 50 mph to 40 mph.**

Ian Metz, 3968 S. East Camano Drive, was in favor of reducing Dallman Road speed limit to 35 mph because of the large volume of people, including children that walked to Tyee Grocery and the beach along Dallman Road and East Camano Drive. He also recommended that all the speed limits should be consistent at 25 mph in residential areas, 35 mph or 50 mph in other areas. He said it would be easier to remember and follow. He also recommended that the speed limit be reduced on East Camano Drive  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile south of Tyee Grocery because of the limited sight visibility since there had been three accidents there.

An unidentified citizen stated the speed limit should be 25 mph on Dallman because of the engineering standards, no shoulders and the road conditions.

Jack Dorsey did agree with the proposed speed reduction of 40 mph and stated that common sense should be used. He suggested that perhaps a pedestrian path be constructed next to the highway. He felt there should be pedestrian enforcement also.

Beverly Micallef, 2891 S. Viewmont Place, felt the main arterial roads should be 50 mph in order to accommodate commuters. She suggested the shoulders should be widened for pedestrian traffic.

Nicole Wineberger, 3194 S. Glacier Lane, was in favor of reducing the speed limit to 30 or 35 mph because of the large number of pedestrians. She was in favor of widening the shoulders because there was no place to walk. She said there was no speed limit sign on Dallman Road, nor had she seen any police officers enforcing the speed limit.

Compton Winspear was in favor of reducing the speed limit to match the condition of the road.

An unidentified citizen commented that people will drive whatever speed they wish depending on their personal agenda.

Jeff Snyder, 1481 S. Pilchuck, a resident for 5 years agreed that Dallman Road should be 35 mph or less because of the high pedestrian traffic. He also agreed the speed limit on East Camano Drive from Dallman Road pass the Tyee Grocery should be revised because of accidents and the blind spots.

**West Camano Drive, 1,150 Feet North of Pebble Beach Road to East Camano Drive reduction from 50 mph to**

**35 mph**

**East Camano Drive, Wilkes Gary Heights to Kalapook Drive (PVT)** Walter Smith, 4064 S. West Camano Drive, felt reducing the speed to 25 mph would be ideal, but agreed 35 mph from Pebble Beach to Wilkes Gary Heights would be an improvement. The road is narrow there, no shoulders, a bank on one side, and no way to widen it.

Ian Metz, resident on that section of the road was in favor of lowering the speed to 35 mph.

**East Camano Drive, 300 Feet North of Teresa Street to a Point 500 Feet North of Mountain View Road proposed reduction from 50 mph to 40 mph**

Compton Winspear suggested it should be 35 mph rather 40 mph to be consistent with other speed limits on the Island.

An unidentified citizen suggested a 35 mph speed limit reduction start at Mt. View Road.

Ann Dorsey, 2772 S. East Camano Drive, a resident for 50 years was not in favor of reducing the speed limit. She stated the commuters need a break. She suggested another north/south arterial road needed to be established. She explained a lot people who commute are not able to be at the Public Hearing, but are not be in favor of the reduction.

Paul Turner, resident since 1958 suggested people leave earlier rather than relying on a faster speed limit and asked if there would be a guarantee that the posted speed limit would be enforced.

Louis Tetreault, 1866 S. East Camano Drive, stated he takes his life into his hands every time he pulls out of his driveway on East Camano Drive because the southbound traffic has to travel up the hill and around the bend and there is limited sight visibility. He was in favor of reducing the speed limit.

Becky Albers was not in favor of reducing the speed limit because of all the people who need to commute on and off the Island. She disagreed that reducing the speed would not slow down the commute.

Bill Vincent, 1103 N. Arrowhead Road, was not in favor of changing the speed limit since there were only 8 houses and only one accident since 1976. He was concerned about reducing the speed on the main roads with the carrying capacity for the island.

Beverly Micallef stated the issues needed to be separated – people on roads or cars on roads. She felt the issue was the speed limit for the cars and the safety issue. The roads need shoulders to accommodate people or a walkway or bikeway needs to be constructed.

Jeff Snyder was in favor of the proposed 40 mph speed limit and wanted to propose another speed limit reduction on East Camano from Karen Way to south of Tyee Grocery.

Commissioner Shaughnessy commented that the proposed speed reduction on Sunrise Blvd. was agreed upon. He stated review would need to be done on extending the speed limit reduction on Arrowhead Road. He also felt the proposed speed limit reduction on North Camano Drive would need to be extended from Sunset Drive to Utsalady. He agreed 35 mph would be appropriate for Dallman Road, but would need to be advertised again at the new proposed speed. He was in agreement with West Camano Drive and East Camano Drive proposed reduction to 35 mph.

Commissioner Shaughnessy understood the controversy on reducing the speed limit on East Camano Drive north of Teresa Street to 500 feet north of Mt. View Road but felt it should be consistent at 35 mph from Mt. View Road to where it joins the current 35 mph. He explained there would be another public hearing on the speed limits that were not agreed upon.

Chairman McDowell suggested since the 85<sup>th</sup> Percentile on East Camano Drive was 54 mph he felt the speed limit should remain at 50 mph.

Commissioner Shelton moved to approve the proposed changes on Sunrise Blvd., West Camano Drive as outlined, and

on East Camano Drive from Wilkes Gary Heights to Kalapook Drive as outlined. The motion, seconded by Commissioner Shaughnessy, carried unanimously.

**[note: continuance with date and time certain to be announced at Board meeting on Monday, April 6, with notice of continuance posted]**

**JOINT BOARD OF ISLAND COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING ON THE GMA DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS**

The Board of Island County Commissioners and the Island County Planning Commission met in Special Joint Session, as advertised, on March 26, 1998, beginning at 6:00 p.m. at Terry's Corner Fire Station, 525 E. North Camano Drive, Camano Island, Wa., to conduct a Public Hearing on the Draft Comp Plan and Development Regulations, as scheduled and advertised.

**Present:**

**Board of County Commissioners:** Chairman Mac McDowell, Commissioners Tom Shaughnessy and Mike Shelton

**Planning Commission:** Rufus Rose, Chairman; Tom Olsen, Richard Hart, Ann Pringle, and Bill Vincent, Members.

**Others:** Keith Dearborn, Island County's Legal/Land Use Planning Consultant, Donna Keeler, Island County Comprehensive Plan Manager, and Phil Bakke, Island County Associate Planner. An Attendance Sheet was circulated and copy on file and part of the GMA record.

Keith Dearborn presented an overview of the proposed draft of the Island County Comprehensive Plan. [Secretary's note: Mr. Dearborn's comments were not recorded on tape inasmuch as tape recording machine problems were experienced; his comments, however, were taken in shorthand and herein noted in the minutes) He explained that public comments regarding the draft were due by April 9, 1998, recommended changes due to Board of County Commissioners by April 28, 1998. Public Hearings for Phase A adoption of the Plan are scheduled for May 6, 7, and 8<sup>th</sup> with Final Plan approval scheduled for August.

Mr. Dearborn's presentation included the following explanation:

**Residential Lands:** 99% of lots are under 5 acres; average lot size is 0.6 acres; 60% of old residential zone converted to new rural, agriculture, or forest zones.

**Rural Residential Lands:** 90% of the lots are under 10 acres; average lot size is 3.8 acres, 19 parcels are over 80 acres in size; 20% of the land area is in lots 20 acres or larger in size. He explained that a large extent of the rural parcels was already developed. He stated it was hard to down zone if you don't have enough large lots.

**Agriculture and Forestry:** designated land increase by 20%, includes 5,000 acres of land previously zoned Residential or Rural Residential.

**Non-Residential:** the Floating zone is eliminated, no increase in land for commercial or non-residential uses. He stated there were 24,000 acres on Camano.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

**[Secretary's Note: Comments by Kris Kristoferson, Edward Babcock and the first portion of Bill Thorn's comments were not recorded on tape due to recording machine problems that occurred, but were summarized in shorthand notes taken and herein noted in the minutes. All three individuals will be notified in writing that this situation occurred, and given the opportunity to testify again before the Planning Commission on April 14].**

**Kris Kristoferson**, 398 N. East Camano Drive, spoke on behalf of his mother, Pat Kristoferson, who owns the farm across from the Plaza Market. He believed the farm would stay the same as it was under the old plan. What will be the total number of lots in rural areas? He did not want the farm to end up as the only green in the middle of development.

**Ed Babcock**, 1069 N. Good Road, submitted a document into the record. He asked that the RA zone be changed to a minimum lot size of 10 acres rather than 20 acres. He stated having a RR density of 5, a RA density of 10, and an AG density of 20 would provide for a good variety of rural densities. He also proposed averaging. Instead of requiring that a 20 acre parcel be split into two 10 acre parcels, why not allow them to be split into one 5 acre parcel and one 15 acre parcel. Mr. Babcock was also concerned about the noise impacts of ultra-light aircraft activity and asked if the County had researched other communities regarding a solution to the problem.

**Bill Thorn**, P O. Box 5, Stanwood, spoke on behalf of the Island County Citizens Growth Management Coalition, and submitted a document into the record. He stated that it should be acknowledged there are some good parts to the plan, but the Coalition has not changed their opinion regarding the following points: 1) The lack of a vision in the plan, 2) Beginning the SEPA review process when the plan released for review is incomplete, 3) The excessive population planning totals, unfair and illegal distribution, 4) The municipalities resistance to acceptance of an appropriate share of the planned growth, 5) Failure to determine the carrying capacity of the County. We need to know how many people we can accommodate in terms of water and transportation. It doesn't matter how many parcels are out there, but what are our resources here on the Island. 6) Unwillingness to adopt impact fees as one tool for dealing with growth, 7) Listed categorical exemptions from SEPA determination, 8) Weakened critical areas regulations, 9) Resistance to commitment throughout the plan by use of "soft" or non-binding wording. They would like to see shall and will – affirmative statements that commit the County to action. 10) An incomplete and confusing SDEIS, that refers back to the November 1996 draft that must be read with it and missing a new environmental summary and litigation measures that should be outlined. The SDEIS says the impacts now are more intense now than the previous plan. 11) Allowing permit applications to vest automatically if the County does not respond in writing within 14 days is a mistake. They felt there was a significant potential for abuse in that area. 12) Excessive density bonuses and increased density in RAIDS (areas of intense development) makes no sense to them.

**Ken Danielson**, 946 Rekdal Road, stated that he and his brother Alvin owned Danielson Farms (370 acres). They were not in favor of zoning to Resource Agricultural because they planned to sell and would not be able to sell it as a farm. They have problems with litter in the fields. People complain about use of water and dumping manure and there are a lot of houses all around them. He explained the price of milk and beef have gone down while the price of equipment and labor have gone up. He believed his soils did not qualify as Class II soils because of poor soil quality and hills. He explained last year they made 1.2% on their investment, worked for nothing, and were getting close to the point where they would not be able to remain in existence as a dairy farm.

**Daryl Brayton**, 923 N. Arrowhead Road, owns property north of the Plaza Market, was concerned about the proposed change in zoning to Village Commercial since he had already contracted for buildings and improvements.

**Jerry Hann**, 4465 E. Crestmont Place, Clinton, spoke regarding 230 acres south of Admiralty Cove on Whidbey Island, abutting on the north and south by RAIDS, with  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile of water bank. He stated the property historically was zoned residential with three units per acre, but with the new plan would be zoned forestry and agricultural with minimum of 20 acres. He stated the property owner would be economically impacted. He explained it was not valuable as a farm even though they were growing hay. He favored clustering on parcels over 80 acres so high value waterfront property could be developed while the balance of the property could be retained as open space. The east side of the property is bounded by Highway 20. He submitted a letter into the record.

**Matt McCune**, Mayor, City of Stanwood, 10222 70<sup>st</sup> St N.W., Stanwood, understood the Camano Community Council favored using the City of Stanwood as Camano's Urban Growth Area. He related that Stanwood – Camano has a unique relationship since they share the same school district, church and medical services, fire and police services, library, sports, youth organizations and he intends to continue the relationship. He asked what would be the legal issues by naming a city in another county as your Urban Growth Area? Stanwood city limits are not contiguous to Island County. Instead of designating the City of Stanwood in your Comp Plan, perhaps Camano should be designated as part of the City's Urban Growth Area, requiring residents to be annexed into the City and pay impact development fees. The City of Stanwood asked the Island County Commissioners not to consider City of Stanwood as an option to Island County Comp Plan.

**Charlie Stromberg**, 816 E. Old Beach Road #206, Freeland, Co-Chairman, Citizens Growth Management Coalition

submitted two documents and a brochure into the record. He stated at a Joint BOCC and Planning Commission workshop on March 20, 1998, that Doug Kelly, Island County Health Department presented a three dimensional computer model of the five layers of aquifers for all locations in the County, with flow maps showing how they work. The USGS study will add data on water recharge and flow. The aquifer water supply can be calculated for the various areas of the County. Mr. Stromberg recommended that aquifer capacity studies be completed before the Commissioners authorize any major projects that will require a lot of water. It applies especially to the UGA's and RAID's. He recommended that priorities be set for the RAID's, considering such areas as Freeland and Clinton on Whidbey and on Utsalady and County Club on Camano. Mr. Stromberg stated about 60 pairs of eagles "nest" in Island County and they are an important part to the tourism. He stated when the eagles leave so will the tourists. He suggested that the Comprehensive Plan state "rural and shoreline character".

**Reece Causey**, P.O. Box 10, Greenbank, stated she recently told Senator Mary Margaret Haugen only socialists could have created the Growth Management Act. She told her she did not want Olympia to direct our local planning. She said Senator Haugen said one day we would thank her for giving us the GMA and she expected the GMA to be more effective than the Endangered Species Act. Ms. Causey did not agree. She felt it would, perhaps, be effective in halting all development in Washington state. She felt our growth is from our children and our grandchildren rather than from out of state migration. She stated the costs of this micro-management will be unaffordable taxes, and unaffordable housing for our future generations.

**Ann Osterberg**, 576 N. Hawk Ridge Place, made a strong statement in support of protecting the rural character on Camano Island and in Island County. She submitted a letter into the record. She supported there not being an Urban Growth Area on Camano Island and thought that too much population growth was allocated to Camano. She was unhappy about high-end population projections being substituted for earlier medium-range projections. She was concerned about the unacceptable high level of land designated as the residential areas of more intensive development. She was concerned about adequate levels of water and transportation capacity to support future growth and about losing rural character.

**Linn Emrich**, 1002 Good Road, felt Resource Agriculture was an improper designation for his property of 150 acres. (He submitted a document package into the record.) He said they bought the property as residential land and paid a considerable amount for it. 40 acres is on high ground and would be very suitable for residential use since the land is close to an arterial (Good Road), on an excellent aquifer, has view potential and close to Stanwood. As a farm, it is a loser, it pays about 1% of the investment. He stated they have leased the land to McMoran Farms for the last four years. A letter from Donald McMoran explains why the land is not suitable to sustain a family economically or remain a farm for the long term because of such factors as small fields, difficult access for farm equipment, soil has chloride content, and crop options are limited by processing facilities. Mr. Emerich suggested Rural Agriculture might be appropriate for the lower 100 acres, provided recreational use would be allowed. Some activities that would be compatible with agriculture are stunt kites, dog activities, polo, parasails, paragliders, ultra-light airplanes, and wildlife viewing trails. The State approved a type D commercial access permit to his property for commercial recreation. Since a natural gas line goes through his property, it could be utilized to heat homes. He pointed out the Comp Plan encourages non-polluting alternatives to wood burning. He proposed a RAID designation for the Cole property, Tobin property and his property (approximately 100 acres total). He pointed out the Resource Ag is a three-step down zone which is a considerable economic hit and he urged the Commissioners to consider Rural Ag for the lower land and a RAID designation on the higher land.

**Ron Wells**, 2459 S. West Camano Drive, has property on the southeast corner of State Road 532 and Good Road, presently zoned Rural Residential agreed with new proposed zoning of Village Commercial. He submitted a letter into the record, which stated the reasons why it should be commercial. Property has had commercial activity since 1947, is surrounded by commercial activity presently, has highway improvements, had Certificate of Zoning Compliance in 1988 grandfathering it as legal non-conforming use. He stated property has been for sale for a year and half and potential buyers were only interested in the property for commercial purposes. Since the current zoning is rural residential and property is only ½ acre, it is not suitable for many home industry uses.

**Carolyn Ehret**, 903 W. 90<sup>th</sup> N., felt there was too much development on Camano. She read in 2020 there would be as many people here as in Marysville. She was concerned about the steady stream of traffic and wondered where all the

people would fit with one road on and off Camano Island.

**Joan McConnel**, 166 N. Sunset Drive, Madrona Beach, was concerned about drainage. She felt there was already a drainage problem and more density would increase the problem. She can't eat the clams any longer due to the drainage problem. Her back yard smells like sewer. She asked if the Comp Plan addressed the drainage problem.

**Jim McKenna**, 682 W. Kodiak Avenue, representing the Camano Community Council, submitted the Council's comments into the record. He stated the population allocation is too great and adverse to the mandates of GMA. They felt the OFM medium projection should be used rather than the high end projection because it could put an additional tax burden on Camano residents. They did not feel RAID's were justified on the Island, and the environmental impacts on transportation, water, etc. needed to be studied more. The Plan did not provide any analysis on future growth impact on water supplies. They recommended prior to any plat approval, the

County should require certification of existing, adequate water supplies and that it will not adversely affect the adjacent properties. The Plan should guarantee existing water rights, and studies for outside water sources should be authorized by a public vote. Mr. McKenna stated the Plan does not address the traffic component, level of service, and intersections, etc. They feel there wasn't enough provision for taxes, or who would pay for the additional future growth for services, transportation, water supplies, etc. Their greatest priority was to preserve the rural character of Camano Island. They felt the SDEIS should be withdrawn and completed according to state law rather than addressing the old plan and the new plan, which results in confusion.

**Wayne Havens**, 544 W. Maple Grove Road, owns property in Country Club area that is zoned NR, bordered on the east side by East Camano Drive, west side by Elger Bay Road, south by Crest Place, and to the north is the Windermere Real Estate office. He stated they have water available and they wanted to keep it zoned NR

**Val Schroeder**, 1361 N. Arrowhead Road, stated the Comp Plan does not have a vision for the next 20 years. If we plan on the high growth we need to address the traffic and water. She was concerned about saltwater intrusion and the impact drilling new wells have on existing well's water supply. She felt they needed a transportation plan. She was concerned about the critical areas for the wildlife and habitat and the whole eco system.

**Horst Stach**, 297 W. 600 S. (Camano Hill Road) has 90 acres, stated he has lived there 20 years and would like to remain rural residential. He wants to remain as a farm and does not want to be down-zoned. Farming does not make economical sense, and if he didn't have an outside income he would not be able to continue farming, but he enjoys the lifestyle. He is worried about the traffic also.

**Paul Turner**, 1409 S. Rainbow Lane, resident for 36 years, stated he has seen a lot of changes and suggested that all the good ideas be combined to come up with a balanced plan that includes commercial areas, but still keep the rural character that includes eagles and wildlife. He felt there were logical areas that needed to be expanded as Village Commercial, such as along SR 532 near Cascade Lumber to generate taxes instead of supporting Snohomish County. He said other areas such as Elger Bay Grocery should be added as commercial. He wondered what designations Fire Stations and Churches have.

**Dale Tyler**, 58 E. Utsalady Road, stated GMA was the root cause of the problems because we are talking about urbanizing Camano Island. He stated Camano Island was a classic rural community. Most of Camano would not qualify as an Urban Growth Area. He noted it is too bad we have to fight for our rights. He was in favor of promoting tourism on Camano Island with conferencing, recreation, hospitality, lodges, and retreats. He felt the military income needed to be replaced with tourism. Tourism offers part time employment and entry level positions for the retired and students. Island County can be a destination point, but they need a place to stay. Tourism does not cause infrastructure. He stated Island County is a diamond in the rough. He was in favor of foot ferries also. He encouraged the Commissioners to raise their sights on tourism in their economics.

**Ronald Everist**, 13423 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E., Marysville, stated his concerns were on south Whidbey and he submitted a letter into the record. They have three parcels a mile from the ferry zoned residential with a proposed zoning of one 5 acre parcel and two 20 acres parcels. He stated this drastic change would be a

great financial hardship since this property was bought for their retirement. He said they couldn't sell the property, had problems with legals, and then the GMA moratorium. Mr. Everist explained they had logged the property and replanted it at great cost, which the state required. Then Island County told them they were prohibited from carrying on Timber Practices because it was in a residential zone. Now, the County is proposing it to be Forest again. There won't be a suitable crop of timber for 60 or 70 years and the yield is less than the price he could sell one lot for. Since it is one mile from the ferry, he wants it to remain in the residential zone.

**John Edison**, 563 N. Waynes Ridge Circle, thinks a great deal of good work has been done on the plan, but his objections were the rural areas of intensive development on south Camano goes from shore to shore which is a barrier to the wildlife. Secondly, he objects to the adoption of the high population growth target. Thirdly, too much of that growth is directed to the rural areas. The intent of the GMA is to direct growth to existing urban areas. He stated

under this plan , 70% of population growth goes to rural areas. If we have this much growth, we will need more schools, which means more taxes to pay for them. He felt we should impose development impact fees so the developers would pay for most of the school taxes, not the existing population of Camano Island. He had no desire to subsidize developers with his ever-increasing taxes.

**Susan Banel**, 576 N. Deer Lane, submitted a letter into the record. She was pleased with the accomplishments of all those involved in bringing this part of the GMA planning process to a close. She had been on the Island County Planning Commission and understood all the hard work, all day meetings, open houses, 120-mile trips to Coupeville, tons of legal documents to read through and understand, besides the personal insults. She felt the proposed Comp Plan was balanced and fair and was the type of compromise that current property owners and future generations of Island County residents could accept.

**Bill Thorn** spoke on behalf of the Island County Citizens Growth Management Coalition and urged the Board to stand by their present decisions regarding Master Plan Resorts and major industrial developments. The Coalition may disagree on the kinds of business that are appropriate to the Island, but they support small business development. They support the idea of departure of the County's dependence on the military. He felt there was a rush in judgment in the SEPA review period and would like to see it stopped until all parts of the plan are out. They would like to see 50% of future growth go into municipalities and or associated with UGA's. Regarding transportation, Camano is a cul-de-sac. It is different than Whidbey in that regard and that needs to be acknowledged. He pointed out in the category called Exemption listed in the Plan there is a revival of the already invalidated non-residential floating zone. This results in permitting commercial structures up to 12,000 sq. ft. and allows for parking up to 40 cars in residential areas, without SEPA review. He asked that those features be deleted from the plan. He stated the proposed density bonuses of up to 300 % effectively invalidate the base densities in several zones. The Coalition supports the idea of bonuses for selective reasons to reward the preservation of open space, critical areas, and affordable housing. He stated it doesn't really make sense to increase densities in this County when we are already overcrowded.

**Mr. Tyler** stated the forestry plan is good but it needs to go a little further. He felt the amount of water the forests use in Island County needs to be in the Plan.

**Kris Kristoferson** mentioned that forests need to be acknowledged for the good impact they have on rural character, wildlife habitat, and making Camano Island a place where a lot of people want to be.

There being no further business to come before the Board of Commissioners at this time, the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m. The Board of County Commissioners will

meet next in Regular Session on April 6, 1998, beginning at 9:30.m., at the Island

County Courthouse Annex, Coupeville.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ISLAND COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

Wm. L.

\_\_\_\_\_  
McDowell, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_ Tom Shaughnessy, Member

\_\_\_\_\_ Mike Shelton, Member

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Margaret Rosenkranz, Clerk of the Board