

## ISLAND COUNTY COMMISSIONERS - MINUTES OF MEETING

### SPECIAL SESSION - SEPTEMBER 22, 1998

The Board of Island County Commissioners met in Special Session September 22, 1998, at Noon in the Island County Courthouse Annex, Hearing Room, Coupeville, Wa., for the purpose of meeting in work session mode with consultants and staff on GMA Plan and Development Regulation issues. The work session was called to order at 12:15 p.m., one of three sessions [working lunches] scheduled from Noon-1:00 on September 22, 23 and 24, providing an opportunity for the Board to discuss with staff any amendments that need to be prepared for the hearing on September 28, 1998. Members of the public attended, but there was no public comments inasmuch as this was a work session only.

#### **Attendance:**

Commissioners: Wm. L. McDowell; Mike Shelton

Consultant/Staff: Phil Bakke, Jeff Tate, Emil King, Keith Dearborn, Vince Moore

#### **Hand-outs:**

- 1) "17.03.170 Potential UGA Expansion Overlay"
- 2) Inventory within UGA – Oak Harbor and Langley
3. Preliminary Review Draft-Analysis of PRD and Affordable Housing Provisions

Mr. Dearborn opened by commenting that staff would like to be able to have in written form, amendments recommended based on public testimony, identified by who is requesting the amendment, a packet ready for the public adoption hearing September 28.

#### **Issues identified:**

1. Amendment to deletion a portion of NAS Whidbey as an open space corridor in the Natural Lands Plan – included by error.
2. Fish and Wildlife Ordinance provisions. Penalty and Enforcement Section – language stated to indicate that where there is an enforcement action it not be on the entire parcel – based on testimony from both sides, a moratorium is not as much a penalty as it is to allow time for the property to heal and restore.
3. Status report on CWPPs. Article in South Whidbey Record seemed to indicate that Langley has significant control over the joint planing area. Have interlocal agreements been negotiated with the cities? Issue: are we putting some people in the joint planning area who are still county residents and then make them plan according to city codes? Concern if a property in the County were to be administered under city codes inside the UGA which may require, for example, dry sewers; if annexed, it is not an issue. Concern is someone should not have to put in city utilities if they do not get city density.

Mr. Dearborn noted that Mr. Kwarsick was preparing an amendment to correct the Federal property issue being included in the natural Lands Plan. With respect to the Fish and Wildlife Ordinance, that ordinance has been adopted; therefore, the Board would have to at one of its regular meetings make a motion to re-consider the ordinance and then move re-adoption with such amendment.

Vince Moore advised that the Planning Directors signed off on the CWPPs but the CWPPs had not been acted on formally by the Cities. Inside the adopted UGA boundaries property would be evaluated under city codes, except in one case in Oak Harbor. Oak Harbor wants a two-tier UGA system. County densities cannot be used inside the UGAs. Interlocal Agreements are still being drafted individually with each of the cities. He provided at this time language drafted to cover Potential UGA Expansion Overlay 17.03.170.

Mr. King advised that still a proposal is within a UGA if property is not annexed to a city, density bonuses will still be used.

Referring to the hand-out provided by Mr. Moore for UGA expansion overlay, Item C, 1 and 2, Mr. Dearborn made the point that until interlocal agreements are adopted, #1 and #2 would apply; after adoption of interlocal agreements, it would be whatever was agreed on within the Agreements.

For #C-2 on the hand-out, Commissioners McDowell and Shelton thought the word "community" should be stricken and the language just refer to drainfields, in that community drainfields insinuates that a number of houses are going into one drainfield which requires a state permit; this language should not limit it to a community drainfield, just drainfield.

The Chair explained his point is that in order to get a building permit what he is saying is that within a UGA there would not be a problem requiring people show a plan how they would have potential for future development, i.e. someone has 5 acres and wants a house on it – they would have to site the house in such a way as to show how the balance of the property could be develop at the time the property is annexed to the city.

Emil and Jeff provided a 5-page hand-out showing the result of an inventory within UGAs.

which the Board reviewed with staff.

### **Oak Harbor UGA**

Improved Lots Unimproved Lots

Lands within PRCs 540 61

Lands Outside of PRCS Res. Acres Res. Parcels

Developed 159.4 81

Redevelopable 108.8 37

Vacant 179.0 37

447.2 155

### **Langley UGA**

Res. Acres Res. Parcels

Developed 27.6 9

Redevelopable 96.9 8

Vacant 28.7 5

153.18 22

A third hand-out was provided - Preliminary Review Draft-Analysis of PRD and Affordable Housing Provisions prepared by Emil King 9/15/98, but not discussed in any detail at this time.

Work session adjourned 1:10 p.m. Board to meet next in Special Session

this evening in public hearing beginning at 6:00 p.m.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**

**ISLAND COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

---

Wm. L. McDowell, Chairman

[Tom Shaughnessy, Member –absent]

---

Mike Shelton, Member

**ATTEST:** Margaret Rosenkranz

Clerk of the Board

**ISLAND COUNTY COMMISSIONERS - SPECIAL SESSION**

The Board of Island County Commissioners met in Special Session on September 22, 1998, beginning at 6:00 p.m., in the Island County Courthouse Annex, Hearing Room, Coupeville, Wa. Wm. L. McDowell, Chairman, Tom Shaughnessy, Member, and Mike Shelton, Member, were present.

Purpose of Session . On September 1, 1998, the Board received final recommendations form the Planning Commission on the following: County GMA Comprehensive Plan; Capital Facilities Planning; and Implementing GMA Development Regulations. The purpose of tonight’s Special Session, as well as Thursday, September 24, 1998 at 6:00 p.m., was to conduct a Public Hearing to take public comments on considering possible amendments to the Planning Commission recommendations on the above Plan Elements and Development Regulations. Final adoption of the Plan and Regulations has been scheduled for September 28 beginning at 2:45 p.m.

Attendance: Approximately 30 members of the public were present at the time of public hearing. An attendance sheet was circulated and copy placed on file. Chris Douthitt was present representing Whidbey News Times. Staff and Consultants present, included: Keith Dearborn; Larry Kwarsick; Stacy Tucker; Phil Bakke; Emil King; Vince Moore; Jeff Tate.

Those who submitted written comments previously were advised they need not re-submit those tonight, although it would be helpful for the record to note the date of previous correspondence. People were asked to address specific requests, and if there were new comments, those needed to be orally presented or in writing tonight or by the end of Thursday’s public hearing. On Friday, the Board meets in special session at 4:00 p.m., for a final GMA workshop prior to the adoption hearing on September 28<sup>th</sup>.

Report on County Wide Planning Policies.

The first item scheduled for September 28<sup>th</sup> at 2:45 p.m. will be a public hearing on amendments to County Wide Planning Policies. Proposed revisions have been noticed in the newspapers, and copies are available for the public and press. Mr. Moore, over the past two months, has been working with city planning directors and staff in terms of revisions to CWPPs. A revision made today with respect to implementing city standards inside those areas will be part of a staff amendment packet to the Plan [copies available to the public this evening]. The Cities are considering draft interlocal agreements which are not required for adoption at the time of the Comprehensive Plan, rather designed to

provide for more formal implementation in terms of process between the county and the cities as it applies to development not only inside the UGA boundary but inside the joint planning areas immediately adjacent to the municipal urban growth areas.

### Public Testimony

Captain Larry Munns, Commanding Officer, NAS Whidbey Island, thanked the Board, Planning Commission and Planning staff for considering throughout the entire process comments and recommendations as the plan developed. Specifically, Captain Munns applauded the housing and economic development goals and policies as something that would provide sailors and their families more affordable housing and a chance for better opportunities of employment in Island County. He also noted that the goals, policies and implementation strategies and the airport and aviation overlay portion of the Plan are well written and should not be changed; what is in place are policies and strategies that will ensure land development in the future that will be compatible with the continued flight operation at the Naval Air Station and limits some of the incompatible development and keeps it to a minimum.

Allan Lipke, Sunnyside Acres, Camano Island, on May 20<sup>th</sup> submitted a letter to Tom Shaughnessy and members of the Board; on June 30<sup>th</sup> received a letter back from Mr. Shaughnessy who indicated at the time the proposal was for a small increase in the size of the RAID which would include Mr. Lipke's property and allow him to accomplish what he desires. Mr. Lipke believed his situation unique in that his property is located 100' from Sierra Vista Association, is a member of the Sierra Vista Association, has two water shares, and pays two assessments because the lot is divided almost in half by an easement road. His desire is that his property be included in the Sierra Vista RAID; otherwise, he fears he would not be able to subdivide as intended.

Arnie Deckwa, Cornet Bay, Oak Harbor, addressed the proposed Rural Village zoning, which according to his understanding, would allow such things as doctor's offices, veterinarian clinics, drinking establishments, and restaurants. He asked for verification whether this would also include such things as rental of cottages or cabins, a motel or bed & breakfast. His property is 5 acres, including the Cornet Bay Shop, Art Gallery and Fly Fishing, located between the marina and the Island County dock. He and his wife are interested put in being able to rent cottages out.

Linn Emrich, 998 Good Road, Camano Island, expressed concern at the Planning Commission decision they could not defend the RAID boundary for Lands Hills Estates as originally proposed because the RAID did not have logical boundaries. His belief is that in fact the RAID does have logical boundaries from a topographical perspective. His original proposal included the easterly sloping property. Those properties all front on the gas line; a good stable aquifer underlies the property, and some of the best wells on the Island are located on the Cole and Emrich properties. The Comprehensive Plan has resulted in a County-wide down zone on average of 56% potential dwelling units. His property with the RAID designation would be down zoned 77%; without the RAID designation it is 94% down-zoned. For the last ten years he and his wife have been doing pre-development work, including roads, drainage improvements, purchasing easements, etc., relying on the zone at the time he purchase of the property.

Charles Cole, 899 N. Smith Road, Camano Island, property borders Mr. Emrich property, included in a letter items of his concern. He attended meetings of the Planning Commission, wrote letters [the last on April 2, 1998], and supports the idea of these properties being included in the RAID. He too would be in the category of a 94% down zone if his property is not included in a RAID. He explained that his property is not agricultural; about 40 acres, half in trees, half in pasture, but lends itself very well for residential development. Although he does not intend to develop in his lifetime, he does not want the door closed to his children or others in the future.

Wes Ralston, Waterford Place, Oak Harbor, next to Mariner's Cove, attended the hearing, along with his neighbor Bob Miles. Together they own a 10 acre parcel as sketched out on a map he displayed. The property butts up against Mariner's Cove. All sides of their lot, except for north of the road, is sub-divided. They use Mariner's Cove road to get into their property. Request: either residential or 2-1/2 acre plots. [left map with staff and will put comments in writing].

Tom Roehl, Project Planning Services, Freeland, spoke on behalf of himself as a resident and property owner, as well as for Island County Property Rights Alliance, and for the Freeland Water District. The Board has received his

comments on the Zoning Ordinance, Shoreline Plan and Code in great detail via electronic medium and noted same for record, requesting those comments continue to be taken into consideration in this process and part of the record.

He pleaded that the Board re-examine the formulas for the commercial AG and rural AG and rural forest designations and cut the numbers in half, both for the designation of those areas as well as for the minimum tract size that could be accomplished in those zones without having to go through a zone change or farm development plan approval. For agricultural operations, or for any other business, the value of its primary asset cannot be devalued by 50% [the difference in value between a 20 acre tract zoned rural and a 20 acre tract zoned agriculture]. While he applauded the Board for having made great efforts in an attempt to create the process of a farm management plan and EDU's which could be transferred to other parts of the property, the latest version he reviewed will not work, i.e. uses that are allowed through PRDs, subtract the amount of land that forever has to be put aside does not accomplish what is intended and does not address the fact that when a farm operation is in a financial crisis it does not have the money and cannot borrow the money to pursue PRD development. He was firmly convinced that the current situation with Engle Farm in Coupeville was caused significantly by what was done in 1984 when it was de-valued in half. He has other detailed recommendations about how to possibly accomplish some of the goals which he will provide later.

Carrie McLachlan, 4320 E. Witter Road, Langley, spoke against the RAID proposed from Sandy Point down to Wycliff Road off Wilkenson Road, noting she submitted a letter to the Board regarding a number of concerns about the RAID, such as: affect quality of life and rural flavor of the Island; 20 acre across the street would like to keep zoned Ag and concerned if in a RAID could be developed and multi-housing allowed; RAID would require a number of municipal changes; blind corner already and not adequate sidewalks. It makes no sense and is not logical to be grouped in with the Sandy Point community. [clarify for the record: previous proposed RAID boundary went past Ridenour to View Road]

Randy Crosby, 4424 Bellellen, from the same neighborhood as the previous also spoke against RAID extension, from Beachwood to Wycliff road. His primary concern was in living on a high bluff approximately 160' , he is aware of different layers of clay, rock, and water coming out from underneath. Adding more houses in that neighborhood could cause eventual washing down over, under or through the cliff area and cause sloughing. He did not believe that the proposed RAID extension complied with intent of GMA.

Ed Chapin, 4310 E. Witter Road, also was quite concerned about the proposed RAID extension in that area as well. Many times he viewed difficulties people in the community had getting out onto Wilkenson Road, a blind corner, 50 mph. Increasing the density of the population in this particular he thought did not make sense given that. He and his wife take lots of walks to the beach and he agreed with the comment that there is a lot of water coming down the hill and the possibility of sloughing is enormous. Wilkenson road is a main thoroughfare for all bikers and joggers between Clinton and Langley, and increasing the traffic on Wilkenson Road means increasing danger to those people.

Gretchen Puentes, 4372 Bellellen Way, spoke in opposition to the RAID boundary proposed, and submitted information for the record the following information with regard to that proposed Sandy Point RAID extension : Copy of RCW 36.70A.070, Section D.4; Map – area of proposed extended Sandy Point RAID – showing "logical boundary"; Letter 9/22/98 from Concerned Citizens Against the RAID, with map and Petition; Letter 9/20/98 from Marilyn Burchett, Langley. In her opinion and the opinion of her neighbors this did not minimize or contain existing areas, rather extending the RAID enlarged from the original boundary set in July. The logical boundary would be Ridenour and not go past Ridenour. South of Ridenour are large fields, rural residential, and farmlands; most of the people he spoke to about this issue [refer to petition] are against the RAID entering the rural area, while those on the other side of Ridenour seem to appreciate it. Her compromise suggestion: roll it back to Ridenour and leave it there and do not include the rural areas the people area against.

Dayna Johnson, 4397 Bellellen Way, opposed the RAID boundary going all the way to Wycliff Road, and noted her letter indicating the reasons dated 9/7/98 . Her family moved from downtown Lynnwood to get away from tract homes, rentals and city life. Some of her neighbors purchased large pieces of land to preserve the openness and quality of life. She is concerned about the water if the boundary for the RAID is extended in that the well only provides for a certain number of houses so she is worried about quality and quantity of water. The beach road everyone uses to walk to the beach is also Bill O'Brien's driveway; drainage water and sloughing of the bank could render the beach road "toast" .

Other concerns she noted were: property values, children's safety, rentals, traffic.

Pat McFarland, 5299 Whitehorse Lane, also expressed concern about the proposed Sandy Point RAID. Her property is 3 acres and the bank very fragile - 3 slides in front of her home. She had a geological survey done and an on-site review which was compared to the geological atlas for Island County, and was told her place is typical of that bank along the whole area, sand underlain with silt with many springs underneath and eroding the bank. This location is also on top of an earthquake fault. Water and septic are issues as well.

Kit Carson, 4965 Wilkenson Road, was for approval of the Sandy Point RAID extension as it affects his property.

Dorothy Bartholomew, Wilkenson Road, was concerned about the RAID boundary extension, and spent all Sunday gathering names on a petition, most new nothing about the RAID. She came to the Board in August because she wanted to be zoned like the rest of her neighbors and not be spot zoned. She noted Elliott Menashe, a regional authority on bluff sloughing, who said he was opposed to intense development on unstable bluffs. Ms. Bartholomew had a newspaper article from 2/9/90 wherein Keith Dearborn called for development in the center of the Island. Her concerns include the habitat - the whole area covers the Langley eagle home range. She likes where she is on Wilkenson Road and wants it just the way it is, just that she not be spot zoned and really objected to the RAID extension as proposed.

Alfred L. Pike, 5216 S. Wilkenson Road, also spoke against the extension of the RAID south to Wycliff Road. His property, two 5-acre tracts, is located across from street from the RAID property and fears he will be in the "zone of influence" and once all the area is developed, his property will be next. The main objection is that most of the area to be added in the RAID is on bluff. Every time a unit is built displaces water out of the ground which adds to surface water runoff. Other reasons he is opposed include: taxes, water, sewer, school and fire department. He is not against the RAID up to View Road but is against it going south. He submitted a news clipping and his letter dated 9/20/98.

With regard to the proposed RAID extension for Sandy Point, Mr. Dearborn advised that the Board in one of its work sessions could review the same information the Planning Commission had. He recalled there had been two requests for expansion of that RAID and the Planning Commission considered both in their deliberations the end of August. Using the criteria available, the Commission determined that the boundary should be expanded.

Commissioner Shelton pointed out that the Sandy Point RAID had been on the map from the beginning, and observed that what the majority of folks were concerned about was not so much the original Sandy Point RAID, but the extension of that RAID boundary.

Glen Engel, Camano Island, referenced communication several times in May about his property, Lot 47, Sunny Shores Acres. He displayed a water association map, blue color representing the water service area for Sierra Vista Association and committed to serving water to all of the lots in the area. The Association designated already an east and west section of his property because he is paying for two water shares. There is a road which physically divides his property into two pieces. He obtained a site plan, septic approval for the second piece of property which is undeveloped. He posed the question of whether or not there was a way to change the zoning or an administrative process to allow subdivision into two pieces in the future. The lot next to him, Lot 46, has already been subdivided and he is sandwiched in-between lots that are smaller than his lot. Dividing the lot will not change the nature of the area whatsoever [lot 47 is 2.38 acres]. He would like to divide the property in half approximately. Viewmont Place is a County road to a point; then gravel easement road.

Commissioner Shaughnessy noted the problem at the moment was that the RAID designation there had been eliminated; there is no RAID. In order to accomplish what Mr. Engel is asking for would be to create a RAID just for those folks and at the moment he did not see that as a possibility; it is a rural area of the County and the minimum lot size is one for 5.

Diane Kendy, Langley, did not believe the County had taken due diligence to inform people where RAID boundaries are, some apparently just by happenstance in Sandy Point found out and organized themselves. She thought there were lots and lots of other residents of the County who had no idea what a RAID is or whether they are in one or not.

John Graham, Citizens Growth Management Coalition, agreed that the EDUs as now structured do not work and urged the Board not pass EDUs in present form. With regard to the Sandy Point RAID, he thought all the comments were prompted by a system that got broke. It seemed initially the County started with a reasonably decent research process but in the last six weeks or so, the process and Planning Commission "got politicized" . He suggested that for the Sandy Point RAID if the Planning Commission used GMA criteria it was in closed session because what he saw was very little or no reflection of GMA criteria, rather some powerful and vocal land owners got what they wanted.

He was concerned the issue of how to describe rural centers and rural villages and mixed uses not fall in a crack. The Planning Commission did not have time to look at it and basically passed the buck to the Board. The Coalition deals with the issue on Pages 5 to 7 in their latest submission. The criteria and description of rural centers is used not only for the rural cores of Freeland and Clinton but also for the large shopping centers at Bayview and Clinton. Areas like Clinton, Freeland, Greenbank and others are all termed Non-residential when people live there and are a mixed use not NR. The current plan names eight rural villages when in fact in Island County there are really no villages as the term used by most people; , i.e. a place where people live and work shop and place in one defined area with village characteristics. The Coalition suggests start by looking at what is there now on the ground. There are: two "towns to be" Clinton and Freeland; two major shopping centers at Kens Corner and Bayview; 7 or 8 smaller shopping centers [half on Camano Island] and perhaps Greenbank might qualify as a Rural Village; 10 or 12 ruralservice zones outlined fine in the Plan as is.

The Coalition suggests:

1. Freeland and Clinton receive two interim zones: (1) Rural Center for the downtown area; and (2) Residential Zone
2. Bayview and Kens Corner major shopping centers: Rural Commercial 1
3. Smaller shopping centers and strip development: Rural Commercial 2
4. Rural Villages – a concept as something that areas like Bayview and some areas on Camano Island can shoot for
5. Rural Service – leave much as it is.

Earle Darst, Central Whidbey, put up a soil map by the U. S. Soil Conservation Service showing classes of soil, both agriculture and non-agriculture in Island County. The best soils in Island County are known as Resource Lands - Ebey's Prairie and Dugualla Bay, for example. White color on the map shows the Rural Agriculture zone, which includes mostly Class 6 soils not considered economical farm land, and very little used for any kind of farm activity except dry hay, horse pasture and meadow. His land is in that classification to which he objects. He read in 17.03.090 that the primary purpose of the RA zone is to protect and encourage the long term productive use of Island County's agricultural land resources of local importance; and is not established to identify geographic areas where commercial farming practices can be conducted in an efficient and effective manner. The designation criteria says that the property has to be at least 20 acres or small contiguous lots owned by the same owner. At the least, he asked for a provision so that an owner can pay up the back taxes in the future and have RA withdrawn and put in Rural.

Keith Dearborn referred Mr. Darst to Section .220 of the Zoning Code, Page 78, D1, which accomplishes what Mr. Darst has asked for. The designation criteria for Rural Agriculture was read correctly, except it is an "and" : "...be 20 acres and in the tax program" to be designated RA. Section 220 of the Zoning Code in D1 provides that at any time in the future back taxes are paid if in Rural Ag then it would automatically revert to Rural Zoning.

Mr. Darst entered in the record a letter dated 9-21-98 from Shirley Greer Clark, Oak Harbor, who is unable to attend a hearing, asking that the new ordinance include provisions for establishment of high quality mobile (manufactured) homes in rural areas. As a senior citizen, she has been waiting for about five years for Mr. Darst's mobile home park to be built.

Mr. Roehl was not sure he agreed with the details and the way the Coalition proposed the change, but suggested one of

the quick fixes would be single family residences not be listed as prohibited uses in rural village, rural service, industry and rural commercial – if someone wants a house on a lot in those areas it should not be prohibited [at least until sub-area planning is done, that should be included]. He recalled correspondence from Freeland Chamber of Commerce, along with a clarification today, regarding the Freeland boundary. When the Freeland Chamber held its meeting the recommendation was made that during the interim period before sub-area planning, that the area south of the highway have some uses restricted. Mr. Roehl believes that is fine with the property owners at this point, but that that would not apply to the area south of the highway on the west part [as clarified by the Chamber in its letter today]. The area the Chamber was addressing which they did not mention in their comments, should allow single family residences and not have that be a prohibited use – pointing out the area on the map to be the Tara Village area, Freeland RAID and two portions of the RAID [colored red on the map] south of the highway; one is the red area east of Fish Road, the area that the Chamber was addressing when they recommended restricting it from retail commercial during the interim. He has talked with Linda Moore about that because he was under the impression she objected to anything south of the highway being in the RAID, but she clarified that she only referred to the red part on the map, and some use restrictions until the sub-area planning process goes through.

Mr. Roehl urged again that the Board re-look at the Commercial AG situation.

### **Documents/Correspondence Entered for the Record**

1. Proposed Amendment by Staff: Regulation of development within unincorporated portion of the municipal UGAs prior to adoption of municipal zoning standards by the County
2. Linn Emrich, Camano Island – letter 9/22/98
3. +Allan Lipke – referred to his May 20, 1998 letter already on record and Tom Shaughnessy's response
4. Charles Cole, Camano Island, referred to his last letter 4/2/98
5. Wes Ralston/Bob Miles: map showing property of concern – 10 acres abutting Mariner's Cove w/access through Mariner's Cove
6. Tom Roehl: referred to all his previous e-mail transmissions for the record, as well as Freeland Chamber of Commerce letters 9/15/98 and 9/22/98
7. Carrie McLachlan, Langley, referred to her written letter submitted previously [Wilkenson Road]
8. Ed Chapin, Langley, letter 9/22/98
9. Gretchen Puentes, Langley, submitted for the record regarding "Sandy Point RAID":
  - A. Copy of RCW 36.70A.070, Section D.4
  - B. Map – area of proposed extended Sandy Point RAID – showing "logical boundary"
  - C. Letter 9/22/98 from Concerned Citizens Against the RAID, with map and Petition
    - A. Letter 9/20/98 from Marilyn Burchett, Langley
      1. Patricia McFarland, Langley, reiterated her comments in letter received 9/21/98
      2. Dayna Johnson, referenced her letter dated 9/7/98
      3. Dorothy Bartholomew, Wilkenson Road, referred to her previous comments on record and in writing, August and September, 1998, the latest 9/21/98, referred to 2/2/90 article with quote from Keith Dearborn [not submitted], and submitted new material as follows:

A. Newspaper Article from South Whidbey Record - upper right hand corner has hand-written date 5/8/87, the article: "Shhh...Eagle nest areas now regulated"

B. One page "Figure 1. Location of the Langley eagle home range in northwest Washington"

1. Alfred L. Pike, Wilkenson Road, Langley

A. Letter submitted dated 9/20/98

B. Newspaper articles 9/19/98 from South Whidbey Record "County backs off on Langley zoning" and "Rural Langley residents worry about county plans"

1. John Graham, CSD, referred to previous submittal, the last submission delivered this Monday, as well as copy via e-mail

2. Earle Darst, Central Whidbey, read and submitted for the record a letter from Shirley Clark, Oak Harbor, regarding mobile home parks, dated 9/21/98

3. Glen Engel, Camano Island, submitted overhead transparency referring to Lot 47 of Sunny Shore Acres on Camano Island [letter referenced to Tom Shaughnessy dated 5/23/98]

There being no further individuals expressing a desire to be heard, the Chair adjourned the special session at 7:30 p.m. The Board will meet next again in special session, September 23, 1998 for a Noon GMA Workshop [working lunch].

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**

**ISLAND COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Wm. L. McDowell, Chairman

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

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

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

Margaret Rosenkranz, Clerk of the Board