

**ISLAND COUNTY COMMISSIONERS - MINUTES OF MEETING
DECEMBER 16, 2002**

The Board of Island County Commissioners (including Diking Improvement District #4) met in Regular Session on December 16, 2002 beginning at 9:30 a.m. in the Law & Justice Facility, Department III (Courtroom 3), 101 N.E. 6th Street, Coupeville, Wa. Mike Shelton, Chairman; Wm. L. McDowell, Member, and William F. Thorn, Member, were present. By unanimous motion, the Board approved and signed the minutes from the meeting held on 12/9/02.

VOUCHERS AND PAYMENT OF BILLS

The following vouchers/warrants were approved for payment by unanimous motion of the Board: Voucher (War.) #155376-155603\$460,913.00.

HIRING REQUESTS & PERSONNEL ACTIONS

As presented by Dick Toft, Human Resource Director, the Board by unanimous motion, approved nine personnel action authorizations, the first 8 a result of year 2003 budget reductions:

Dept.	PAA #	Description/Position #	Action	Eff. Date
Health	101/02	Dept. Asst. 2423.03	.75 to .63 fte	1/1/03
Health	102/02	WIC Clerk/Certifier 2424.00	1.0 to .63 fte	1/1/03
Health	103/02	Dept. Asst. 2423.02	1.0 to .63 fte	1/1/03
Health	104/02	Sub. Ab. Prev. 2428.00	.75 to .5 fte	1/1/03
District Ct. Clerk	100/02	Probation Off. I 1103.01	1.0 to .5 fte	1/1/03
Maintenance	099/02	Vault/Micro Clerk 503.04	1.0 to .5 fte	1/1/03
Auditor	105/02	Custodian .5 fte 901.04	1.0 to .5 fte	1/1/03
Sheriff/Jail	098/02	Deputy Auditor 211.00	1.0 to .5 fte	1/1/03
	097.02	Correction Officer 4015.12	Replacement	12/16/02
			120 Day Provisional Hire	

**INTERLOCAL COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN ISLAND COUNTY
AND SKAGIT COUNTY FOR DETENTION SERVICES**

Interlocal Cooperative Agreement between Island County and Skagit County for Detention Services, Contract # RM-JUV-02-0080 for the period 12/1/02 – 12/31/04 was approved as transmitted by Michael Merringer, Juvenile Court Services Director.

CLOSING PAPERWORK FOR ENGLISH BOOM TIDELANDS - SELLER – STEVEN L. AND NORMA J. KNOPP

As presented and recommended for approval by Lee McFarland, Assistant Director, GAS, the Board by unanimous motion approved and signed the closing papers for English Boom Tidelands – Seller – Steven L. and Norma J. Knopp.

CONTRACT - CONSTRUCTION WORK AT DAVE MACKIE MEMORIAL PARK

A contract between Island County and J & L Builders, Langley, for Construction Work at Dave Mackie Memorial Park [RM-GSA-02-0090] in the amount of \$14,890.00 was approved by unanimous motion of the Board, as presented and recommended for approval by Mr. McFarland.

CONTRACTS FOR 2% HOTEL MOTEL TAX FOR 2003 PROGRAM YEAR

As a follow-on action to having approved the projects and activities funded by 2% tax revenues November 18, 2002, the Board by unanimous motion approved four contracts:

Camano Arts Association, Camano Island Mother's Day Studio Tour \$1,500
 Camano Island Chamber of Commerce, Camano Island Visitor Info. Center \$5,000
 Greater Oak Harbor Chamber for Commerce, Marketing and Tourism Program \$12,000
 Skagit/Island County Museum Assn., 14 Fun-Filled Family Museums Brochure \$1,500.

HEALTH CONTRACTS APPROVED

By unanimous motion, as transmitted by the Health Services Director under cover Memorandum dated 12/11/02, the Board by

unanimous motion approved two health contracts:

NSRSN Contract #NSRSN-Island-02 Amendment (1) for Mental Health Services, in the amended amount of \$10,000, for new total contract of \$122,085;

Developmental Disabilities contract #HS-04-02 with Island Employment Services - \$5,000.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES

Claim for Damages #R02-032CD/a by Puget Sound Energy came before the Board, having been continued from last week in order for further review with PSE to explain the cost breakdown attached to the claim, specifically the line item shown under labor reflecting \$162.64 straight time for 1.00 hours. The Claim submitted in the amount of \$2,179.19 came with a recommendation of approval by the Public Works Department and GSA/Risk Management. Bill Oakes reviewed additional information obtained from PSE as requested which justified labor costs and hours. The billing shows \$75.91 per hour and time and a half shown separately, broken out in further detail, including material costs for splicing, pass through for the sub, and actual home office overhead. Sub hours shows arrival on site at 1630 and leaving at 2117 with a crew of 4. By unanimous motion, the Board approved Claim for Damages #R02-032CD/a by Puget Sound Energy in the amount of \$2,179.19.

Claim for Damages #R02-025CD Christina Wick, pulled from today's agenda at the request of the Risk Manager.

REVIEW MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORTS FROM AUDITOR & TREASURER

Treasurer's Report

Linda Riffe, Treasurer, submitted the written Treasurer's Current Expense Report for the period ending November 30, 2002. Revenue from investment interest is ahead of the original budget projected for 2002 but by comparison earned \$852,199 less than 2001 due to the significant drop in interest rates. Interest rates have continued to drop in the last four weeks, running now between 1.12 and 1.5% depending on length of investment. Excise tax-PUD is ahead of the original projection; Liquor Excise Tax, Franchise tax, property tax interest, jail and building permits are on target.

Auditor's Report

Suzanne Sinclair, Auditor, submitted the Auditor's Report for the same period, also in writing. briefly summarizing to note that Current Expense is ahead of where it was last year relative to revenue collection. Expenditures are behind last year relative to a comparison. Revenues for funds are behind where they were last year relative to the budget but expenditures are also behind.

STORMWATER MITIGATION AGREEMENT #PW-0220-87 - BERDJ & NEVRIKA YAZARYAN HOLMES HARBOR GOLF & YACHT CLUB

Stormwater Mitigation Agreement #PW-0220-87 with Berdj and Nevrika Yazaryan related to Holmes Harbor Golf & Yacht Club; Tract A, Division 8; Sec. 3, Twp 29N., R 2E, was approved by unanimous motion of the Board, as presented by Mr. Oakes.

BID AWARD FOR COUPEVILLE MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr. Oakes provided to the Board a bidder's tabulation for the project Coupeville Mental Health Facility, under Work Order #204 and recommended award of bid to the low bidder, J & L Builders, Langley, for the base bid along with Additives #1, adding two examination rooms, and Additive #5, interior signs. Mr. Oakes provided a copy of a December 13, 2002 letter from Jess C. Jamieson, Ph.D./CEO, Community Mental Health Services, confirming concurrence in the award of bid for base bid plus Additives #1 and #5, bid plus additives 1 and 5]. The letter further confirmed that CMHS and Compass Health would proceed with a \$125,000 fund-raising campaign to help cover a portion of the estimated costs of the project. CMHS. The Board, on unanimous motion, awarded bid to the low bidder, J & L Builders, Langley, under Work Order #204, Coupeville Mental Health Facility, for the base bid along with Additives #1 and #5.

CONSULTANT AGREEMENT #PW-0220-95 - DAVIDO CONSULTING GROUP

By unanimous motion, the Board approved Consultant Agreement #PW-0220-95 with Davido Consulting Group for On-call Civil Services - Drainage for a three year period, with maximum amount payable \$250,000.

CONSULTANT AGREEMENT #PW-0220-96 - CHINOOK ENGINEERING

The Board by unanimous motion approved Consultant Agreement #PW-0220-96 with Chinook Engineering for On-call Civil Services - Fish Passage for a three year period with maximum amount payable \$50,000.

SOLID WASTE BAD DEBT WRITE-OFFS APPROVED

As presented by the Public Works Director, the Board by unanimous motion approved Solid Waste 2002 uncollectible bad debt write-offs in the total amount of \$1,088.32 for fiscal year 2002, detailed in a memorandum dated December 6, 2002 from Bill Oakes.

PUBLIC INPUT/COMMENT

Realizing the number of folks in the audience were present to comment on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment having to do with establishing a new Seattle Pacific University Special Review District, Chairman Shelton commented on the structure of comprehensive plan amendments to the Island County Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the proposed amendments came before the Planning Commission at a public hearing, and with regard to the SPU proposal, from his understanding, there had been very little participation at the hearing before the Planning Commission. He reviewed with the audience the structure under State law when a proposal comes before the Planning Commission. The Board has not chosen to hold its own public hearing, and a public meeting would begin this morning at 10:30 a.m. to consider the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan, of which the SPU proposal is just one. With the understanding that members of the public desire to make comments ahead of time without benefit of having heard the Planning Department presentation or comments from the proponents, he agreed comments could be made at this time.

Rod Barnes, Coupeville, questioned removal of a condition on a donation of property making it a preserve, and thus opening it to development. He agreed with concerns expressed recently in a newspaper article, and also expressed concern about the project inasmuch as Eagles winter there and raise their young.

Ferrall Baker, Coupeville, maintained that the public had not been properly notified even though a notice may have been in the paper he thought 90% of the people had heard nothing about it until 22nd of this month when the article in the paper said comments had to be in by 4:30 p.m. that day. The SPU project he believed would directly affect old growth forest, noise levels, traffic and water, and comments in SPU's master plan about desalination.

Commissioner Thorn commented to note that the proposal before the Board was not a development proposal or any construction; strictly a proposal for rezone and nothing built absent having appropriate water, sewer, etc. The Chairman added that whether or not the special review district, if granted, there are still development possibilities on the property. Should the SRD be approved, and at some point in the future a project proposed, the first thing would have to be a showing of adequate water source.

Sara Bress asked that the meeting be adjourned and rescheduled at another time in a room that could accommodate the number of people who desire to comment, with proper notice, since there is no exhibit attached to the plan showing that it was noticed.

Consensus of the Board was to continue on with the public meeting as scheduled and noticed.

PUBLIC MEETINGS HELD: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ANNUAL REVIEW AMENDMENTS

Public meetings were held beginning at 10:30 a.m., introduced at the meeting of November 4, 2002 and scheduled originally for December 2, 2002, subsequently rescheduled for public meeting on December 16, 2002 at 10:30 a.m. to consider the following Comprehensive Plan Annual Review Amendments:

- **Ordinance C-91-02, PLG-014-02, amending the Island County Comprehensive Plan and Chapter 17.03 ICC to incorporate an amendment for the Greenbank Farm Special Review District [GMA # 7288]**
- **Ordinance C-93-02, PLG-016-02, amending the Island County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 17.03 ICC to establish development standards for Parks [GMA #7290]**
- **Ordinance C-94-02, PLG-017-02, amending the Island County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 17.03 ICC to establish standards for Rural Event Centers [7291]**
- **Ordinance C-95-02, PLG-018-02 – Amending Chapter 3.40 ICC, Public Benefit. Rating System (PBRs) [GMA**

#7292]

- **Ordinance C-92-02, PLG-015-02, amending the Island County Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 17.03 ICC and the Zoning Atlas, to establish a new Seattle Pacific University Special Review District. [GMA #7289]**

The Planning Department was represented by Phil Bakke, Planning and Community Development Director, and Jeff Tate, Assistant Director. The public in attendance numbered 40 +.

Ordinance #C-91-02, PLG-014-02, amending the Island County Comprehensive Plan and Chapter 17.03 ICC to incorporate an amendment for the Greenbank Farm Special Review District

Mr. Bakke outlined the proposal. In 1998 when the County adopted the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Regulations, Greenbank Farm was zoned as SRD at that time, and in the interim period the Greenbank Farm and Island County worked cooperatively with the Greenbank Farm Management Team and the Port of Coupeville to come up with a set of zoning standards to accompany the SRD. Up until now there have been no zoning standards to guide the future growth, development or operation of the Farm, instead was handled as an existing use under the code. The proposal has been properly through the Planning Commission who recommended unanimously approval of the proposal. The proposal was forwarded to Washington State agencies for comment and no comments have been received from any of those agencies.

Laura Blankenship, Executive Director, Greenbank Farm, was in the audience supportive of the proposal being approved.

Benye Weber, Port District of Coupeville Commissioner, expressed appreciation for the Planning Department's involvement and work with the Greenbank Farm Management Group and Port of Coupeville in looking at some of the issues and coming to a decision in how best to approach some of the issues related thereto. She looked forward to the Board's favorable approval of the proposal.

By unanimous motion, the Board adopted Ordinance #C-91-02, PLG-014-02, amending the Island County Comprehensive Plan and Chapter 17.03 ICC to incorporate an amendment for the Greenbank Farm Special Review District. [as approved GMA #_____]

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

IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING THE)	
ISLAND COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN)	ORDINANCE C-91-02
AND CHAPTER 17.03 ICC TO ADOPT A)	PLG-014-02
MASTER PLAN AND IMPLEMENTING)	
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS FOR THE)	
GREENBANK FARM SPECIAL REVIEW)	
DISTRICT.)	
_____)	

WHEREAS, the application for CPA 032/02 was requested by Greenbank Farm to adopt a Master Plan that establishes a regulatory framework that applies to the existing Special Review District zoning designation. The proposed application was duly docketed for Planning Commission consideration and the Department's required report forwarded to the Planning Commission within the prescribed time period; and

WHEREAS, CPA 032/02 and the accompanying Greenbank Farm Master Plan are provided by the Port of Coupeville in response to the prior designation of the parcel as a Special Review District. On September 29, 1998, the Board of Island County Commissioners (BICC) adopted the Island County Comprehensive Plan and development regulations and Zoning Atlas which went into effect on December 1, 1998. At that time the 151 acres of the Greenbank Farm that are owned and operated by the Port of Coupeville were designated as a Special Review District. The BICC stated that the Greenbank Farm was a special and unique use in Island County that did not fit under the regulatory framework of any specific land use designation. It was for this reason that the BICC approved the concept of the Special Review District as a means of addressing the needs of special uses that are important to the residents of the County, don't fit within the definition of any land use designation and which need a designation that will afford the owners and operators of such uses with a fairly high degree of flexibility and predictability to continue operating while creating use and development parameters that local residents could rely upon in anticipation of future growth; and

WHEREAS, the Port of Coupeville has prepared the Master Plan and requested amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance in order to establish a predictable land use scenario which will allow the Port of Coupeville to plan for the future maintenance and operations of the Greenbank Farm; and

WHEREAS, the Master Plan indicates, and the Planning Commission reaffirms that while preserving the farm and its agrarian value in the community is critical, of paramount importance is ensuring that the Greenbank Farm is an economically viable operation. The Master Plan and development regulations have been drafted in a manner that are intended to provide ample flexibility and predictability for the planning and operations of the Greenbank Farm; and

WHEREAS, the Island County Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed amendments on May 28, 2002 in the Commissioner's Hearing Room in Coupeville. During the hearing, Planning and Community Development staff presented to the Planning Commission and the public the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, verbal public input was received during the public hearing. Representatives of the Greenbank Farm provided rationale for their request and a description of their long term intentions and goals. All public input provided during the hearing was in support of the proposed amendments. No additional written testimony was provided following the hearing; and

WHEREAS, during deliberations on June 11, 2002, the Planning Commission provided unanimous support for the proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission concluded that this proposal would ensure that the Greenbank Farm and Port of Coupeville are provided the flexibility and predictability that are needed in order to continue its operations; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission concluded that this proposal includes provisions and standards that will protect public resources and the surrounding environment such that future growth and operations of the Greenbank Farm do not have a deleterious impact on the community; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission declared that the Greenbank Farm is an asset to the community. It is a use that provides substantial economic, aesthetic, cultural and historic significance on Whidbey Island. It is a use that the residents of Island County want to preserve. Adoption of a Master Plan will allow for a more secure and predictable environment in which to operate and plan for the long term which will allow for more efficient and wiser use of public money. Therefore, it is in the best interest of Island County to adopt a Master Plan that provides predictability and flexibility for the Port of Coupeville to continue its maintenance and operation of the Farm while creating parameters that limit expansion and use of the facility; and

WHEREAS, the Master Plan is the policy document that governs use of the Greenbank Farm Special Review District. If conflicts arise between development regulations and the Master Plan, the Master Plan shall prevail. When considering interpretations of unspecified use and/or standards of the subject site, substantial deference shall be afforded to the Master Plan. However, if a standard has not been specified in the Special Review District Zoning designation or the Master Plan, standards found in other sections of the Zoning Ordinance may be used as precedence when providing interpretations or establishing policy; and

WHEREAS, no time limit duration has been incorporated into the Master Plan or the development regulations. The Special Review District shall run with the property indefinitely. Any change in ownership, abandonment of the Master Plan or subdivision and sale of land shall require review and approval through the annual review amendment process. If the Port of Coupeville desires to remove the Special Review District designation, the property shall revert to Rural zoning designation; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to WAC 197-11-600, the County SEPA official has determined that the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan and Chapter 17.03 relating to the Master Plan adoption and addition of development standards for the Greenbank Farm Special Review District are not likely to have a significant adverse environmental impact that was not considered in the environmental documents prepared for the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations; **NOW, THEREFORE**,

BE IT ORDAINED that amendments to the Island County Comprehensive Plan, the Greenbank Farm Master Plan, attached hereto as Exhibit A, and amendments to Chapter 17.03 ICC, attached hereto as Exhibit B, that establish development standards for the Greenbank Farm Special Review District, are hereby adopted. Material underlined is added.

Reviewed this 4 day of November, 2002 and set for public hearing at 10:30 a.m. on the 2 day of December, 2002.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:

Elaine Marlow
Clerk of the Board

Revised on November 18th, 2002. See Inserted Page.

Reviewed this 18th day of Nov. , 2002 and set for public meeting at 10:30 a.m. on the 16th day of Dec., 2002.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:

Ellen K. Meyer, Deputy
Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 16 day of December, 2002.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:

Elaine Marlow
Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DAVID L. JAMIESON, JR.
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
& Island County Code Reviser

[Exhibits A and B placed on file with the Clerk of the Board]

Ordinance #C-93-02, PLG-016-02, amending the Island County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 17.03 ICC to establish development standards for Parks.

Summarizing, Mr. Bakke commented that it was in 1998 that a Park zone was established covering publicly held property for park purposes without having adopted park zoning to accompany it to guide development of those lands. The County Planning Department worked with GSA/Parks to define standards, looking at what neighbors have done, and forwarded a recommendation to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission held two hearings: one on Camano Island May 14, and one in Coupeville on May 28th. The Planning Commission voted unanimously to forward the proposal to the Board for consideration, noting that the ability to develop park lands to be an essential asset for the community and that Park Zone standards fit their goals.

Commissioner Thorn referred to the precedent set on Camano with the Four Springs Farm; a good model for the future of parks in the County, one that can help pay for its own operation and maintenance; he wanted to be sure nothing proposed here precluded that. Mr. Bakke confirmed day use rental facilities are permitted under these modified standards provided the property is the right choice, fits the type use, meets the standards and does not negatively impact the community or adjacent neighbors.

By unanimous motion, the Board adopted Ordinance #C-93-02/PLG-016-02 amending the Island County Zoning Ordinance,

Chapter 17.03 ICC to establish development standards for Parks. [as adopted GMA # _____].

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

IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING THE)	
ISLAND COUNTY ZONING)	ORDINANCE C-93-02
ORDINANCE, CHAPTER 17.03 ICC, TO)	PLG-016-02
INCORPORATE LAND USE)	
STANDARDS FOR THE PARKS ZONE)	
_____)	

WHEREAS, the application for DRA 068/02 was proposed by the Planning and Community Development Department to add Parks Zone Standards to Chapter 17.03 ICC; and

WHEREAS, when the Island County Code was adopted in 1998 Parks Zone Standards were not included despite our creation of a Parks Zone and zoning property as Parks in the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Park Zone Standards have been reviewed for consistency with the Island County Comprehensive Plan including the Parks Element and have been determined to be consistent; and

WHEREAS, the Island County Planning Commission held public hearings on the proposed amendment on May 14, 2002 on Camano Island at the Camano Senior Center and a second public hearing on May 28, 2002 in the Commissioner’s Hearing Room in Coupeville. During the hearings, Planning and Community Development staff presented to the planning Commission and the public the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, all public input provided during the hearing was in support of the proposed amendment. No additional written testimony was provided following the hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission concluded that this proposal, as amended, would ensure orderly and compatible development of Parks land in Island County and expressed unanimous support for the proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission declares that Parks are an essential Public asset and should be given flexibility to meet the broad range of needs presented by our local community; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to WAC 197-11-600, the County SEPA official has determined that the proposed changes to Chapters 17.03 relating to the development standards for the Parks Zone are not likely to have a significant adverse environmental impact that was not considered in the environmental documents prepared for the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations; **NOW, THEREFORE**,

BE IT ORDAINED that amendments to Chapter 17.03 ICC, attached hereto as Exhibit A, that establish development standards for the Parks Zone are adopted. Material underlined is added.

Reviewed this 4 day of November, 2002 and set for public hearing at 10:30 a.m. on the 2 day of December, 2002.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ISLAND COUNTY, WASHINGTON**
Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:
Elaine Marlow
Clerk of the Board

Revised on November 18, 2002. See Inserted Page.

Reviewed this 18th day of Nov., 2002 and set for public meeting at 10:30 a.m. on the 16th day of Dec., 2002.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ISLAND COUNTY, WASHINGTON**
Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:

Ellen K. Meyer, Deputy
Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 16 day of December, 2002.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:

Elaine Marlow
Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DAVID L. JAMIESON, JR.
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
& Island County Code Reviser

[Exhibit placed on file with the Clerk of the Board]

Ordinance #C-94-02, PLG-017-02, amending the Island County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 17.03 ICC to establish standards for Rural Event Centers

As Mr. Bakke noted, the Planning Department sponsored this amendment in conjunction with members of the community who had old farming activities slowly being transformed over the years, such as the Morris Farm, into some event-type activities in association with weddings, etc. The Planning Commission held hearings, one on Camano May 14, another in Coupeville on May 28, and deliberated on the matter June 11 and recommended approval. This adds a definition of rural event center; specific standards and modifies language in the Rural Agriculture zone. Particular attention was given to this by the Planning Department, Planning Commission and the community to try to ensure standards allow siting these where it makes sense, i.e. large pieces of property without a great number of neighbors so as to not adversely impact the immediate or surrounding community. A home on site is a requirement; and item M on page 8 sets forth standards to be accomplished with that type permit, and the number of 200 people can be exceeded, however it would become a matter of a public hearing requirement before the Hearing Examiner in order to exceed that number.

Bob Whitlow, Fort Casey, recalled his inquiry over a year ago of the Planning Department about regulations for weddings, since a number had been done at the Colonel Crockett B&B Inn. He met with staff on two occasions who were then writing regulations for rural event centers and had them on site to demonstrate how much 5 acres was and that 200 people on 2 acres of land rattle around, noting it is a lot of room. He wanted to be confident that rural event centers would be allowed thus applicants not have to come back for approval when there is an event coming up. His main concern was item g on page 8 stating "No off-street parking or loading area shall be permitted within 50 feet of a side or rear property" and thought that excessive.

Commissioner Thorn explained that the requirement was for the purpose of providing a buffer for the neighbors since there would be a lot of cars coming and going which could mean a lot of disruption. Mr. Bakke commented that the Rural Zone has a 50' setback now under the Zoning Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan stresses the need for having those buffers between non-residential uses and neighboring properties; 50' is the number that was developed years' ago and consistently implemented to achieve that buffer.

Marianne Edain asked about the maximum number of events allowed at one of these sites in any given year. If no maximum has been specified, it is a deficiency that should be corrected in the Ordinance. Without a maximum, there could be a spot-zoned NR use in a rural neighborhood. Mr. Bakke explained that when the Planning Department reviews an application under this provision the applicant has to explain the duration and number of events that would be occurring. That would be one of the factors used to determine how stringent to apply standards and setbacks, etc. He envisioned that permits would include limitation on the number of events based upon the size of the property, location, access, neighbors, etc.

Roger Purdue, Coupeville, asked about the meaning of "in keeping with the character of the area". He did think that when 200 cars are parked, for example, along a hay field on Ebey's Prairie, it could be a visual feeling to others around where they would not like it, and it would be nice to plan it ahead of time. Mr. Bakke explained that the County applies character standards to each of the zones; but those standards are not spelled out.

By unanimous motion, the Board adopted Ordinance #C-94-02/ PLG-017-02 amending the Island County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 17.03 ICC to establish standards for Rural Event Centers. [as adopted GMA

_____]

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

IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING CHAPTER)	
17.03 ICC, THE ISLAND COUNTY ZONING)	ORDINANCE C- 94 -02
ORDINANCE, TO INCORPORATE A)	PLG-017-02
DEFINITION AND STANDARDS FOR RURAL)	
EVENT CENTERS)	
)	

WHEREAS, the application for CPA 069/02 Rural Event Centers was requested by the Island County Planning Director to establish a new allowed use and associated land use standards that would govern the use. The proposed application was duly docketed for Planning Commission consideration and the Department’s required report forwarded to the Planning Commission within the prescribed time period; and

WHEREAS, the Island County Planning Commission held two public hearings on the proposed amendments. The first publicly noticed hearing was held on May 14, 2002 at the Camano Multi Purpose Facility located on Camano Island. The second publicly noticed hearing was held on May 28, 2002 in the Commissioner’s Hearing Room in Coupeville; and

WHEREAS, during both hearings, Planning and Community Development staff presented to the Planning Commission and the public the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. During both hearings, an opportunity was provided for the public to address the proposed amendments. No public comments were received in any form prior to the June 4th deadline established by the Planning Commission during its May 28, 2002 hearing; and

WHEREAS, Rural Event Centers provide an economic opportunity that is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan including preservation of rural character, providing for environmentally friendly commercial opportunities, encouraging tourism as an industry and providing local employment opportunities for Island County residents; and

WHEREAS, on June 11, 2002 the Planning Commission concluded that this proposal is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and recommended adoption; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to WAC 197-11-600, the County SEPA official has determined that the proposed changes to Chapter 17.03 ICC relating to the incorporation of development standards for Rural Event Centers is not likely to have a significant adverse environmental impact that was not considered in the environmental documents prepared for the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations; **NOW, THEREFORE**,

BE IT ORDAINED that amendments to Chapter 17.03 ICC, attached hereto as Exhibit A, that establishes development standards for Rural Event Centers are adopted. Material stricken through is deleted and material underlined is added.

Reviewed this 4 day of November, 2002 and set for public hearing at 10:30 a.m. on the 2 day of December, 2002.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:

Elaine Marlow
Clerk of the Board

Revised on Nov. 18, 2002. See Inserted Page.

Reviewed this 18th day of Nov., 2002 and set for public meeting at 10:30 a.m. on the 16th day of Dec., 2002.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member

William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:

Ellen K. Meyer, Deputy
Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 16 day of December, 2002.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:

Elaine Marlow
Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DAVID L. JAMIESON, JR.
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
& Island County Code Reviser

[Exhibit placed on file with the Clerk of the Board]

Ordinance #C-95-02/PLG-018-02 Amending Chapter 3.40 ICC, Public Benefit Rating System (PBRs)

Jeff Tate provided the staff summary on the proposed amendment and reviewed the three types of changes proposed:

1. Series of technical changes
2. Beefing up of requirements for being awarded points for the given resource [wetland, stream setbacks, archeological sites, etc.] have to go above and beyond what everyone else has to do, important because whenever a tax reduction is awarded there is a tax shift and the rest of the taxpayers pick up the cost.
3. Using an example in the case of a wetland, when an application is received it would have to be accompanied by a wetland delineation report and a report to define specifically how the wetland would be protected, the report done at the applicant's expense prepared by a biologist .

Commissioner McDowell inquired whether or not the additional requirements that may involve a cost would inhibit people from doing this. Mr. Tate noted there were other provisions in PBRs that define some of the goals. The goals require a demonstration of how more protection will be provided than everyone else. Departmental policy is that at the time of application submittal evidence needs to be turned in, and he confirmed that every PBRs application turned in thus far had included that information based on departmental request.

By unanimous motion the Board approved Ordinance #C-95-02, PLG-018-02 – Amending Chapter 3.40 ICC, Public Benefit Rating System (PBRs). [as approved GMA #_____]

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

IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING THE)	
PUBLIC BENEFIT RATING SYSTEM AND)	ORDINANCE C-95-02
ISLAND COUNTY CODE, CHAPTER 3.40 ICC)	PLG-018-02
)	
)	

WHEREAS, the application for CPA 067/02 was requested by the Island County Planning Director to amend the Island County Public Benefit Rating System (PBRs). The proposed application was duly docketed for Planning Commission consideration and the Department's required report forwarded to the Planning Commission within the prescribed time period; and

WHEREAS, the Island County Planning Commission held two public hearings on the proposed amendments. The first publicly noticed hearing was held on May 14, 2002 at the Camano Multi Purpose Facility located on Camano

Island. The second publicly noticed hearing was held on May 28, 2002 in the Commissioner's Hearing Room in Coupeville; and

WHEREAS, during both hearings, Planning and Community Development staff presented to the Planning Commission and the public the proposed PBRs amendments. During both hearings, an opportunity was provided for the public to address the proposed amendments. No public comments were received in any form prior to the June 4th deadline established by the Planning Commission during its May 28, 2002 hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission found that technical and syntax corrections are appropriate and needed; and

WHEREAS, during deliberations on June 11, 2002, the Planning Commission indicated that the PBRs is a valuable and important tool in preserving open spaces, critical areas and rural character. However, in order to properly carry out the stated intent of the program which is to award tax reductions to property owners who are willing to preserve private property and for which the general public will benefit, a high standard should be applied when considering the overall public benefit. Therefore, the Planning Commission supports the amendments that require a landowner to increase the level of protection afforded to each of the resources above and beyond what is already required under the existing county codes. The Planning Commission has stressed this point because as tax reductions are awarded to the individual property owner, the remaining tax paying citizens will experience a tax increase in order to offset the County's loss in revenue. It is for this reason that eligible PBRs lands should be required to very clearly demonstrate the public benefit that local landowners will be paying for; and

WHEREAS, during deliberations on June 11, 2002, the Planning Commission provided support for revisions to the tax matrix that is used to determine what percent of tax reduction may be awarded once the point value for all eligible resources is calculated. The Planning Commission agrees that the current system, which provides a 50% tax reduction for only a five point total value, is not appropriate. As a result, amendments are needed that both lower the percent tax reduction and raise the total number of points that a landowner must acquire in order to be eligible; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission concluded that amendments to the PBRs are necessary. The Planning Commission recommended adoption of these amendments that are technical in nature, that modify the tax matrix and that establish new or improved eligibility standards; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to WAC 197-11-600, the County SEPA official has determined that the proposed changes to the Public Benefit Rating System and Chapter 3.40 ICC are not likely to have a significant adverse environmental impact that was not considered in the environmental documents prepared for the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations; **NOW, THEREFORE**,

BE IT ORDAINED that the Board of Island County Commissioners hereby adopts amendments to the Public Benefit Rating System and Chapter 3.40 ICC, hereto attached as Exhibits A and B. Material stricken through is deleted and material underlined is added.

Reviewed this 4 day of November, 2002 and set for public hearing at 10:30 a.m. on the 2 day of December, 2002.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ISLAND COUNTY, WASHINGTON
Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:
Elaine Marlow
Clerk of the Board

Revised on Nov. 18th, 2002. See Inserted Page.

Reviewed this 18th day of Nov., 2002 and set for public meeting at 10:30 a.m. on the 16th day of Dec., 2002.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ISLAND COUNTY, WASHINGTON
Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:
Ellen K. Meyer, Deputy
Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 16 day of December, 2002.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ISLAND COUNTY,
WASHINGTON
Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:

Elaine Marlow
Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DAVID L. JAMIESON, JR.
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
& Island County Code Reviser

[Exhibits placed on file with the Clerk of the Board]

Ordinance C-92-02, PLG-015-02, Amending the Island County Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 17.03 ICC and the Zoning Atlas, to establish a new Seattle Pacific University Special Review District

Mr. Tate made the staff presentation on SPU Camp Casey Conference Center.

The Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation of approval to the Board. There has been numerous phone calls, letters and press coverage. The proposal is to incorporate the Casey Conference Center Master Plan into the Island County Comprehensive Plan and amend the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Atlas to designate the Camp Casey Conference Center as a Special Review District. Current zoning would change from Rural to Special Review District [SRD] and the Comprehensive Plan would be amended to incorporate a site specific Master plan that establishes goals and policies for use of the property. Chapter 17.03 of the Island County Code would be amended to create a new zoning designation that would establish specific permitted uses that would be allowed on the property and govern land use standards.

SPU submitted an application for a comprehensive plan amendment in January, 2000 for rezone from Rural to SRD, which was added to the annual review docket. The Planning Commission held hearings on June 7 and 20, 2000 and based on public input during the hearings and deliberations of the Planning Commission, with agreement of SPU, decided not to make a decision. SPU went back to the drawing board to develop a master plan. In January 2002 SPU submitted a master plan for the 270 acre facility, with three elements: rezone, master plan and land use standards. The master plan describes the history of the site, existing conditions and uses, significant environmental features, narrative of future desired uses, conceptual site plan and land use standards that would apply to the facility. The proposal was added to the 2002 annual review docket and public hearing held by the Planning Commission on May 28, 2002, noticed in the local newspaper [dates and copies can be provided]. Whidbey News Times ran a feature "Camp Casey to Expand" on April 10 2002; South Whidbey Record ran a feature "University Proposes Expansion of Camp Casey" on April 20, 2002; and the Everett Herald ran a front page story "Revamping Casey" on April 29, 2002. The Whidbey News Times article included a drawing showing the conceptual site plan. Both Whidbey News Times and South Whidbey Record closed their stories by stating that the "master plan will be considered by the Island County Planning Commission which will hold public hearings which are expected to occur in June or July" and both articles provided detailed information. Following those articles, notice was provided to all local newspapers of the hearing by the Planning Commission to be held May 28, 2002. Even though notice requirements were met and the additional press coverage through those articles, there was very few attended the hearing and those attending provided positive feed back and support for the project. The project has not changed since the May 28, 2002 meeting. The Planning Commission followed the public hearing with a public meeting on June 11, 2002, to deliberate on the proposal and notices of that meeting were provided in local newspapers. During the meeting the Planning Commission voted to provide a recommendation of approval to the Board of County Commissioners, with no opposition.

During and before this process, SPU was in contact with Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve and the National Parks Service and conducted meetings with them to present the proposal to those agencies, including the master plan, what the SRD is and the concept. National Parks Service and Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve representatives did not attend the hearings nor did they provide written comment.

Important to note this is not a development proposal, rather lays the frame work for uses, structures and standards to be met if SPU wants to apply in the future for a permit to do anything on the property. SPU took the lead by looking

at the Greenbank Farm SRD and Au Sable Institute examples. When and if SPU applies for a development permit at a future date, compliance with every regulation is required, including under Rural zoning, and compliance with such regulations as Critical Areas, Shoreline, Clearing & Grading, Archeological and Historic Preservation, etc. The proposal would allow a rezone and adoption of zoning standards, establishes limits which currently do not exist on what can be permitted on the acreage; establishes the range of uses that currently exist and those that may be permitted in the future. However, none of these uses or structures can be established until SPU applies for a permit and the permit is approved. The same as in any zone, a wide variety of uses and structures are allowed, but only after the owner applies for and receives permit approval. None of the other regulations are usurped or undermined. Compliance with these standards is required in the same manner whether it is the Rural Zone or SRD. The Master Plan will not reduce or affect compliance with those regulations.

When considering the proposal staff and the Planning Commission discussed at great length the current zoning of Rural and the proposed SRD. A great deal of emphasis was placed on answering what can be allowed under the Rural zoning and what could be allowed under a SRD. Under current zoning standards the property could be developed or redeveloped in accordance with the standards of the Rural zone. The Rural zone for 270 acres would translate to a maximum of 122 permanent residences, as well as a wide variety of non residential uses such as country inns, golf courses, mini storage, cell towers, etc. allowed in the rural zone. The property contains a number of environmental features and through zoning and subdivision rules, a lot of that land could be put in open space and preservation and cluster development. A conference center is not a use allowed in the Rural zone. Because it is not allowed it falls under the category Existing Uses 17.03.230 which allows for expansion of existing uses. Existing uses are allowed to expand provided specific standards are met such as parking, lighting, etc. SPU today could submit an application for a Certificate of Zoning Compliance and ask for expansion of an existing use, and SPU could be in a very good position to claim that the County had no authority to limit that expansion.

By applying for a SRD and submitting a master plan SPU has imposed conditions on themselves, providing predictability for them and the public. Expansion of the current facility which provides 40,000 camper days per year [1 bed per night]; up to 1030 beds could be allowed, an increase of 360; a conference facility up to 8,000 sq. feet; expected occupancy rates would increase from 535 to 825 individuals. Given proposed increased levels outlined in the plan, coupled with the goals, objectives and standards that would be established, and considering what could be allowed under current zoning, it was the position of the Department and Planning Commission that adoption of the rezone, master plan and land development standards should be approved.

Concern has been raised by some members of the public related to clearing and grading activities that might be permitted in the forest at a future date, and Mr. Tate explained that the proposal does not permit removal of any timber primarily because the forest is designated as a critical area and by DNR as a natural heritage site. The County's critical areas ordinance states that if any land disturbing activities are to occur in any heritage land that a biological site assessment is to be prepared by a qualified biologist and a habitat management plan prepared by a qualified botanist and forwarded to DNR Heritage program for review and comment. That requirement has not changed.

Mr. Tate described a telephone conversation with DNR he had on Friday about the proposal that had been forwarded to the DNR office in Olympia, and could not explain why staff of DNR in its Heritage Program section did not get an opportunity to review it. In the conversation on Friday Mr. Tate described the proposal to the staff person in that section, indicating to her that: the conceptual site showed all cabins within the heritage site; that development permits for future activities would be required, along with biological site assessment and habitat management plan and that the County would forward that to DNR as is required by the County's Critical Areas Ordinance for review and comment; that the master plan creates some standards within the forest which do not exist today; minimum standards include a 30' setback from significant trees; tree retention standards for significant trees; construction techniques in order to avoid impacts to root structure. DNR may establish different setbacks after their review. After the description by telephone, the DNR staffer stated that: "it sounds like you guys are doing a good job up there" and "I think that you are the only jurisdiction in Washington that actually protects heritage lands" and "there are no other jurisdictions that have it included in their Critical Area regulations".

Tim Martin, Attorney at Law, Langley, introduced representatives of SPU in attendance:

Darrell Hines, Associate Vice President, Business and Facility Services
 Donald Mortenson, Vice President for Business and Planning
 Susan Hizon, Coordinator of Planning and Development, Casey Conference Center
 Ralph Keller, Keller Associates, certified planner and principle author of the master plan

Mr. Hines made the point that SPU had been present on Whidbey Island almost 50 years, had been a good neighbor and steward of the natural environment of more than 300 acres and the physical structures at Camp Casey. They plan to continue as a good neighbor. SPU desires to find ways to make it as economically feasible as possible to remain in that capacity and it is for

that reason the master plan and request for rezone has been requested. SPU proposes to continue functioning as a non-profit organization, offering services, conferences and retreats, educational seminars and services to other non-profits and governmental agencies. The proposal is an expansion of what now exists. The focus of activities now is limited primarily to youth and by using the same concept they believe they can expand into a different more mature age market and generate revenue, and remain sensitive to the environment within which they function.

Ralph Keller displayed during his presentation a poster board of Figure I in the Master Plan showing the proposed boundaries for the SRD, including approximately 270 acres. Two of the large parcels are within Crockett Lake and Crockett Lake Wetlands, all to be preserved in open space except for a small interpretive shelter at the edge of Crockett Lake. The SRD would also include the developed Camp Casey site, the old army barracks, officers housing and playgrounds; these areas would remain as is except for a small addition of 1200 sq. ft. to the sea lab used for marine biology education and a small addition to one of the two mess halls. Most of the development will occur in the area north of the Officers Housing as shown on a blow-up of that area noted as Figure 4 in the master plan. Proposed development would occur north of the Officers Housing and north of the alumni house and south of Casey Inn which is not part of SRD, there would be a new educational building; to the northwest of that would be an area where cabins would be constructed in the woods. Most of the buildings will be cabins, 300-350 sq. ft., built within the woods on pier structures so as to not have major impacts on adjacent trees. About 25 would be replacements for existing camp sites, proposing that the existing campground be retained in part for group camps. The cabin area is primarily outside the natural heritage site. Development to take place in the forest would be proposed retreat buildings.

The development plan gives an idea of scale: 6 buildings proposed within small clearings and contain 8 residential units and common meeting space, developed in phases of two at a time; group road for access. Most of the road exists as a campground road and they would like to talk to the County about standards for that road, and if possible, not have connection to Engle Road except for fire and emergency services. SPU tried hard to be consistent with goals of Ebey's Reserve and did not want buildings visible from Admiralty Inlet or Engle Road, nor push buildings close to the bluff because of significant trees. The rest of the forest area would be retained. There is about 43 acres of forest altogether within the SRD; a maximum of 5 acres, if everything were built, would be cleared. Of those 5 acres about 2.5 are within the natural heritage site; about half of the natural heritage site is located to the north of the northern boundary of the SRD. The bluff area and the beach would be retained.

The total number of beds currently is 670 and 80% occupancy is considered peak. The proposal is for 360 additional beds for a total of 1030. There is a provision in the master plan for potential expansion of uses through a Conditional Use process, almost identical to the provision in the Au Sable SRD, that would allow up to a 50% expansion of the new development, not the total development.

Mr. Hines clarified that the ownership of SPU property that continues on and is not a part of the SRD is approximately 60 acres to the north. As far as SPU's plans for the 60 acres, that portion immediately north of the SRD boundary is seen as "flexible"; if successful with this concept, perhaps there is an opportunity to expand more into that area; if not, that property would stay much in its current form. At the far northern portion SPU is looking at the sale of roughly 5 acre lots.

Farrell Baker, Fort Casey Road, Coupeville, asked about the six 8,000 sq. ft. structures and where those would be built; the fifty 300- 350 cabins, and status of existing camp sites. Mr. Keller said that the precise location would fall within the general zone located on the diagram displayed, adjusted to avoid any conflict with any significant trees and to be consistent with any habitat management plan recommendations. Intention is to build up to 50 cabins, of which 25 would replace campsites. Cabins are shown on the plan; all but about 10 would be outside of the natural heritage forest and a forest that has somewhat lower quality trees and habitat. One of the problems now is that camp sites can only be used in good weather and take up space; like to replace those with cabins for year-around use. SPU proposes retention of a portion of the campsites to use as group campsites.

Mr. Baker was interested to hear more about the 60 acres north of that line on the diagram and leaving that open to increase by 50% as included in the master plan.

Mr. Keller clarified that the increase in amount of proposed expansion is 360 beds by 50%, not the whole total development of Camp Casey. Increasing cabins by 50% would only come with significant limitations within the amount of forest area that could be cleared and development could not occur those areas to be retained as open space. And Mr. Hines said that the

figure of 180 beds would relate to beds that would be in the cabins or retreat buildings or any other type of facilities.

Commenting to Mr. Baker on his concerns about waterlines, drainfields, power lines and desalination plan, Mr. Hines stated SPU was not at a point where specifics were appropriate; SPU believes there are reasonable alternatives for securing water for the site; if it is not possible no permit would be approved. SPU is not prepared to answer detailed questions about a desalination plan now, other than that the engineer who was asked to analyze the matter came to the conclusion that cost wise and technologically it appeared to be a viable alternative, but much more analysis of that would have to be done. Mr. Keller added that the master plan has some specific provisions for protection of those larger trees and there is a tree retention standard that would not allow any tree with a trunk diameter of 42" or above to be cut and would also require at least a 30' buffer around those trees. The area shown in dark green would be off limits and there would be no cutting or clearing within that area at all; the only area for clearing for development would be in the lighter green areas.

Mr. Tate explained further on this point. Given the critical area location in a high quality eco system, the HMP will have to look at significant trees as well as the eco systems, root structures, etc. There are trees along the coastal area not that wide but trees that the HMP could require to be retained because of Eagle issues or because the first number of feet off the bluff is a significant coastal habitat.

Marshall Bronson, Chairman, Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve, an interested party in all the development within the Reserve area, worked with SPU since the Reserve was created and maintained a good dialogue in areas of mutual concern. Use of Camp Casey facilities has been a great boon to the community. The buildings and grounds have retained the historical continuity the Reserve strives to maintain and National Park Service advised on historic colors of the recent repainting. It is understandable the University needs to make this into a self-supporting financial unit while retaining the historical character. The Reserve wants to work with SPU in the preservation of the visual and natural aspects of Camp Casey. There are some concerns about the preservation of the Golden Paintbrush especially in the area known as the Bocker Reserve and in the establishment of the trail which will connect Fort Casey Park to Ebey's Landing to the north.

Steve Erickson, speaking for WEAN and himself, asked SPU representatives about any maps, aerial photos, anything where they've drawn a boundary, polygon or line that delineates what is and what is not a natural heritage site. Mr. Keller stated that the polygon is located both on DNR maps and also on County's sensitive areas maps but SPU had not put that on their sites in part because it is fairly vague and in working with their environmental consultants, pointed out that the forest really does not conform exactly to what is shown and there are some other significant areas that are outside of it and some within.

Mr. Erickson made the point that polygons on the Natural Heritage maps are made on very small scale because if they attempted to show in detail every natural feature the data set would be huge in GIS. He held up a measuring tape at a certain distance and asked "is this a significant tree?". Mr. Hines indicated that would depend on the circumstances of the tree, the type of tree, location and age, and ultimately would be defined in the habitat management plan.

Mr. Erickson commented that the master plan states that trees 42" or greater will not be cut, but asked about trees under that size. Mr. Hines stated that if the plan goes forward there of course would have to be some clearing; how that will be done and how those areas would be selected, etc. SPU would have some judgment, the biologists/botanists and Planning staff – there is a process for deciding it and SPU will be a participant in that process.

It was Mr. Erickson's contention that since the Master Plan stated SPU will not cut anything 42" and above the implication is that trees under that size can and will be cut. Mr. Erickson then submitted into the record the following [submittals are on file and have been placed in the GMA Record]:

- 1.. Written comments under letter dated 12/16/02 [GMA # _____]
2. Photos of the site including an aerial photo [GMA # _____]
3. Supporting attachments, the majority the 2001 Natural Heritage Plan of the State of Washington [GMA # _____]

Summarizing from his letter:

1. Rezone fails to satisfy the requirements for SRD which is to be approved only upon determining that features of historical, archaeological or environmental significance will be conserved or highlighted.. Destruction is proposed of 5 acres of an unlogged low elevation coastal ancient forest; omission of the northern 65 acres from the SRD fails the requirements for such rezone; the area of 30 acres likely to be sold includes part of the heritage forest and endangered Golden Paintbrush. Plans do not provide for conservation of this portion of the species an the northern 30 acres should either be included in the SRD or the sale only to a conservation buyer.

2. Island County's refrain that the proposal is not well enough defined to permit property environmental review is

bogus. The issue is clearly ripe for environmental review and decision now, and the County is evading its responsibility for full environmental review.

3. Sending a packet of all proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan is not the same as consulting with State agencies and sending a full package of all proposed GMA actions to the Natural Heritage Program parent agency does not constitute either notification or request for consultation. The County failed to consult with the Department of Fish & Wildlife as required by the Comp Plan.
4. SPU proposed changes intended to mitigate environmental impacts are not adequate. [specifics cited].
5. Although SPU states it will not site drainfields within the forest, it does not address the impacts from underground utilities.
6. Precedent-setting aspects of allowing non-contiguous SRDs need to be seriously considered [specific examples cited].
7. Proposal constitutes urban development.
8. Development constitutes a Master Planned Resort [MPR] – a planned unit development in a setting of significant natural amenities with primary focus on destination with short-term visitor accommodations.
9. The claim that the proposal provides increased protection for critical areas is not accurate. [specific examples cited].
10. Allowing inclusion of non-contiguous land while refusing to include contiguous property of extreme environmental significance violates the requirements and intent of SRDs.
11. Although SPU's forester states that the forest is unique because of the wind sheared picturesque trees along the bluff, WEAN contends such trees are not unique along the West Coast of Whidbey Island, common along bluff edges. The presence of such trees is not what makes this forest important. This is a high quality example of increasingly rare unlogged forest in this region and on Whidbey Island and is irreplaceable.
12. The forest shows extensive evidence of the impacts of the windy coastal environment; wind shear is not confined to a narrow band along the bluff. Windthrown trees reveal the extremely shallow root systems referred to in the Island County Soil Survey. Snags with tops snapped off are common and most exhibit signs of pileated woodpecker activity.
13. County improperly relied on proprietary information, specifically a soils report, forestry report and site information provided by biologist Josh Wozniak. Underlying materials must be made available for review by the county and public or the veracity of the Dec. 6 "so-called" habitat assessment should not be accepted.
14. SPU's rationale for development is flawed.
15. WEAN adopts by reference all other comments and testimony made by all other parties regarding this proposal [listed].

Susan Moore, Engle Road, Coupeville, inquired about the parcel north of the development where SPU did a boundary line adjustment and segregated into parcels, specifically whether the marketing of those properties would go to help finance this development. Mr. Hines responded that there is no specific plan for marketing at the present time; potential is probably there to sell some number, five perhaps, but that still would leave a number of acres between that area and the SRD.

Bill Viertel, Cathedral Drive, Coupeville, made use of the drawings used by SPU in his comments, focusing on the forest issue. He stated that what you see is a compass rose pointing north – the land swings out to Admiralty Head and so the winds during storms generally prevailing out of the west divide around the Olympics and come up the east side of the Olympics along Hood Canal, crash into Whidbey in this area. If anything is done to destroy the integrity of the forest, the result would be blow downs and it will not matter if the heritage forest is cut or not, it will go away anyway. If you build all of these large buildings you are destroying an integral part of the forest that has built up over time and those winds will work on that forest. He was not against SPU expanding to achieve economic viability, but was against this particular incarnation of the plan.

Marianne Edain, WEAN, asked that the public meeting be converted to a public hearing. She referred to the Memorandum from Jeff Tate dated 12/12/02 [GMA record # _____] responding to the many comments. Comments are addressed at small sub parts and no opportunity for systematic review of the proposal, and no environmental review as a whole. As currently proposed doing two buildings at a time, with SEPA review, would mean SEPA is done in a vacuum. Where Mr. Tate says SPU would have to abide by the Critical Areas Ordinance but she contends that the ordinance would not prohibit logging of the heritage site. SEPA and GMA were combined for purposes of review and are and GMA issues need to be addressed. She thought there were probably serious water and traffic issues, and believed there were alternatives to taking out 5 acres or a heritage forest that cannot be replaced. Because of the geology, those trees are all interlaced roots are a good solid 30" deep and go horizontal and are woven together; if that woven root mat is broken it works it way through. Forests are integral eco system units; a chunk cannot be cut and the forest expected to function as a forest; rather it will be fragmented. She agreed the proposal fits the definition of a destination resort and is not appropriately called a SRD unless all environmental elements are included and protected, and this project does not enhance or restore the habitat nor does it protect the resources.

Ms. Edain went on to point out a great many inconsistencies in numbers in Jeff's reports. 670 plus 360 does not make 825. Comparison with what could or might happen if this rezone is not granted – SEPA does not allow such comparison, but evaluation of the proposal as it stands. The statement that "this standard requires each tree be looked at independently" is precisely what she fears; the trees must be looked at as a whole. The statement "it is commonly accepted" in regard to protection of trees she pointed out what is commonly accepted is not true of a rare site and this is a rare site. Although Mr. Tate stated that the master plan environmental check list and application refer to the site as a natural heritage land acknowledges that the entire forest therefore is protected, she said that while the Critical Areas ordinance designates heritage lands as a critical area there is no provision which prohibits clearing, grading, development or other uses and activities within this critical area. With regard to the trail, SPU states they prefer not to open the trail to full public access due to liability issues, proximity of the trail to Golden Paintbrush and inconsistencies of use with Casey's programmed use of the trails – SPU needs to say what they plan to do. Ms. Edain told the Board it would be appropriate to remand this back to the Planning Commission and ask for full environmental review and a proposal which puts whatever development happens outside the heritage forest, or outside all of the forest.

Frank Stowe, 655 S. Engle Road, Coupeville, brought up two concerns:

1. Water. Problems. Already when showering in the morning water goes down to a trickle; same is true in the evening while getting dinner..
2. Transportation. Transportation and the impact on Coupeville and Engle Road, now and in the future. In a few years this will impact such cars down to Al Sherman's house in the same mess as in Oak Harbor trying to get in and out of that city.

Rod Barnes, S. Engle Road/Cathedral Drive, located across from the Bocker Preserve, questioned why all of a sudden this was not a preserve; if 30 acres are sold to fund the SPU project and housing allowed, he believed would destroy the habitat for Golden Paintbrush as well other wildlife such as deer and Eagles.

Roger Purdue, residing at Cathedral Drive, Coupeville, which he referred to as an unrecorded illegal plat that stands out as one of the nice places in the Pacific Northwest; fulfilling and surpassing sewage requirements, manage their own affairs, but a poor job done on the trees because of the way it was laid out; he has personally hauled out over 65 dead trees of major size due to wind storms. Mr. Purdue gave everyone a history lesson going back to the 1990-91 storm and the daily log of his father-in-law, Wilbur Sherman. He appreciates having SPU as a good neighbor, but did have some concerns, one being intention for the very extreme upper end that long narrow strip along the water. He has the arrowhead collection from Wilbur Sherman that came off that farm and most off about 3 acres, and includes arrow heads, skinning tools, spear points, some dating back 9,000 years.

George Crampton, Oak Harbor, a Planning Commission member, addressed the Board as a citizen and not as a member of the Planning Commission. He was present at the presentations by SPU and the public meetings. He recalled having grilled SPU on a number of topics. He thought the SRD was a good idea but was concerned about precedent and contiguity issue of putting similar properties together to get 150 acres.

In response to a question from Commissioner McDowell with respect to comments that the proposal does not meet SRD requirements and should be considered a master planned resort, Mr. Tate commented that within the Comp plan and zoning ordinance there is designation criteria for what a SRD is and criteria includes: 150 acres; non-profit organization; demonstrate commitment to archeological, historic and environmental protection. In staffs review and in presenting the proposal to the Planning Commission, the proposal met that criteria. The Critical Area ordinance does not prohibit clearing and grading within a heritage site but states that a DNR natural heritage site is a critical area, or any land disturbing activities

within that critical area must have a biological site assessment and habitat management plan, a required element. SPU has added into their Master Plan some definite minimums: no tree larger than 42"; nothing within 30' of any significant tree and staff felt it met standards. GMA contains a definition for what a master planned resort is. Camp Casey is an existing conference center and has never been considered a master planned resort; this is a non-profit organization and the proposal meets all standards for a SRD.

Commissioner Thorn believed that Mr. Tate did a good job of explaining the nature of the action before the Board: a rezone with no specific development approved; made possible in the future through a permit process yet to go through, and made possible so SPU can look at a controlled way to expand and an economic way. He personally thought SPU had been very sensitive to the needs of the community and area, and suggested if there are specifics the audience has concerns about they should address those directly to SPU. SPU has been a great neighbor for a long time and trying to be sensitive in a continuing way. He was convinced this proposal affords a lot more protection to the properties involved than if no action is taken; it increases safeguards and restrictions and it has not been a secret process.

Commissioner McDowell stated that up until just very recently he had not heard any negative comments about SPU, verbally or in writing. Most people in the County appreciate Camp Casey and having SPU as a steward of that land rather than a for profit organization running Camp Casey, or having it torn down some 25+ years ago when there was no longer any need for those barracks, etc. In reading all the literature and comments that came in recently, he noted concern seemed to center on three things: trees, water and transportation. He reiterated any action taken today was not a permit to build anything; it is a rezone to set the parameters that would allow SPU to go back and decide what they may want to do within boundaries set by a rezone. By this rezone SPU agrees to set limitations on future size. Current code would not set those parameters. Those limitations will be in affect when and if SPU comes in with a permit, and they will have to go through the permit process and have to address all of the issues site specific. If SPU cannot obtain water, they will not receive permit approval regarding transportation. If through some type platting someone else owned the property staff indicates somewhere between 108 and 122 houses could be built which would generate over 800 trips per day year-around [8 – 9 trips per day per house]; while SPU proposal will generate 188 trips in the summer and 20 in the winter. As to comments about the trees and root systems intermingled; if true he assumed on the very first application that would have to be addressed; the same is true with blow downs, etc. Any building in that area brings on requirements for a habitat management plan and biological site assessment, special scientific studies that will be done. He could not think of a better thing as opposed to having different houses with numerous owners. From his perspective, he thought the County in total was getting a better outcome potentially than if the property were sold off in mass.

Commissioner Shelton stated that the property commonly known as Casey Campus and owned by SPU is a privately owned piece of property. He did not foresee that becoming publicly owned and if it were, public ownership would have the same cost of operation. He read several e-mails insinuating somehow there are ulterior motives on part SPU, etc; if there were some evidence of that there would be some credibility to those comments but in his opinion SPU has done over the last 50 years everything the County could have ever hoped for them to do by maintaining this wonderful facility that has benefited many children in Island County and throughout Western Washington. He recognized concern on the part of many in the audience about 5 acre lots that perhaps SPU may or may not sell; however, what is done today has no affect on that.

Commissioner Thorn moved that the Board approve Ordinance #C-92-02/PLG-015-02 in the matter of amending Island County Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 17.03 ICC, the Island County Zoning Ordinance and the Island County Zoning Atlas to rezone the Camp Casey Conference Center to Special Review District and to adopt goals, policies and development standards for the Camp Casey Conference Center Special Review District. Motion, seconded by Commissioner McDowell, carried unanimously. [as approved GMA #_____].

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

IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING THE ISLAND)	
COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, CHAPTER 17.03)	
ICC, THE ISLAND COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE)	
AND THE ISLAND COUNTY ZONING ATLAS TO)	
REZONE THE CAMP CASEY CONFERENCE CENTER)	ORDINANCE C-92-02
TO SPECIAL REVIEW DISTRICT AND TO ADOPT)	PLG-015-02
GOALS, POLICIES AND DEVELOPMENT)	
STANDARDS FOR THE CAMP CASEY CONFER-)	
ENCE CENTER SPECIAL REVIEW DISTRICT.)	

)

WHEREAS, the application for CPA 031/02 was requested by Seattle Pacific University (SPU) to rezone 270.2 acres from Rural to Special Review District. The proposed application was duly docketed for Planning Commission consideration and the Department's required report forwarded to the Planning Commission within the prescribed time period; and

WHEREAS, CPA 031/02 and the accompanying Master Plan were provided by Seattle Pacific University following a previous submittal in 2000 under CPA 708/00. CPA 708/00 was a request to Island County to consider rezoning the Camp Casey Conference Center from Rural to Special Review District, however, this request was not accompanied by a Master Plan. SPU had intended to first request the rezone and, if it was approved, prepare the Master Plan and seek amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance during the 2001 annual review docket. During this time, the Planning Commission visited the site and were provided an escorted tour of the facility and grounds. Ultimately, CPA 708/00 was rescinded by SPU after the Planning Commission raised several questions and concerns regarding the specific goals and expansion plans that were being considered by SPU. Given that SPU had not yet prepared the Master Plan, very little specific information could be provided to the Planning Commission. As a result, SPU withdrew the application in 2000 and reapplied in 2002 for a consolidated package of amendments accompanied by a Master Plan that outlines all the specific existing information and future plans; and

WHEREAS, SPU has prepared the Master Plan and requested amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Atlas in order to establish a predictable land use scenario which will allow SPU to plan for the future maintenance and operations of the Camp Casey Conference Center. Under the Rural Zone, very little predictability is afforded because the Conference Center is not an allowed use. By changing the zoning and establishing specific land use standards that govern the use of the Conference Center, the Conference Center will become a legal conforming use in the Special Review District zoning designation; and

WHEREAS, the Island County Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed amendments on May 28, 2002 in the Commissioner's Hearing Room in Coupeville. During the hearing, Planning and Community Development staff presented to the Planning Commission and the public the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning Atlas; and

WHEREAS, verbal public input was received during the public hearing. Representatives of Seattle Pacific University provided rationale for their request and a description of their long term intentions and goals. All public input provided during the hearing was in support of the proposed amendment. No additional written testimony was provided following the hearing; and

WHEREAS, during deliberations on June 11, 2002, the Planning Commission provided support for the proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission concluded that this proposal would ensure that the Camp Casey Conference Center is provided the flexibility and predictability that SPU needs in order to continue its operations; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission concluded that this proposal includes provisions and standards that will protect public resources and the surrounding environment such that future growth and operations of the Camp Casey Conference Center do not have a deleterious impact on the community; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission declared that the Camp Casey Conference Center is an asset to the community. It is a use that provides substantial economic, aesthetic, cultural and historic significance on Whidbey Island. It is a use that the residents of Island County want to preserve and keep in the ownership of SPU. Therefore, it is in the best interest of Island County to adopt a Master Plan that provides predictability and flexibility for SPU to continue its maintenance and operation of the Center while creating parameters that limit expansion and use of the facility; and

WHEREAS, during deliberations on June 11, 2002, the Planning Commission questioned the fact that the 270 acres is not contiguous. 187 acres are located on Crockett Lake and are disjointed from the remaining acreage. The designation criteria in the code and Comp Plan state that eligible lands must be 150 acres or greater in size, in a single ownership and owned/operated by a non-profit organization. The Planning Commission finds that while the property is not physically contiguous it is historically connected. The two separate areas are connected by their use. There is no code requirement that mandates all 150 acres be contiguous. Even though the code does not specify parcels be contiguous, the Planning Commission found that it is advantageous that the parcels be contiguous or that use of the parcels be substantially connected by means of historical use; and

WHEREAS, CPA 031/02 is an amendment to the Island County Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Atlas, and the entire Master Plan will be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan in addition to amendments to the existing Comprehensive Plan language. Amendments will be incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance which governs uses, intensity of uses, size of structures, land use standards and design. The Zoning Atlas will be amended to change the zoning from Rural to Special Review District; and

WHEREAS, the Master Plan is the policy document that governs use of the Camp Casey Conference Center Special Review District. If conflicts arise between development regulations and the Master Plan, the Master Plan shall prevail. When considering interpretations of unspecified use and/or standards of the subject site, substantial deference shall be afforded to the Master Plan. However, if a standard has not been specified in the Special Review District Zoning designation or the Master Plan, standards found in other sections of the Zoning Ordinance may be used as precedence when providing interpretations or establishing policy; and

WHEREAS, no time limit duration has been incorporated into the Master Plan or the development regulations. The Special Review District shall run with the property indefinitely. Any change in ownership, abandonment of the Master Plan or subdivision and sale of land shall require review and approval through the annual review amendment process. If Seattle Pacific University desires to remove the Special Review District designation, the property shall revert to Rural zoning designation; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to WAC 197-11-600, the County SEPA official has determined that the proposed changes to the Island County Comprehensive Plan, hereto attached as Exhibit A, Chapter 17.03 ICC, hereto attached as Exhibit B, and the Island County Zoning Atlas, hereto attached as Exhibit C, relating to the incorporation of the Camp Casey Conference Center Master Plan, implementing development regulations and rezone are not likely to have a significant adverse environmental impact that was not considered in the environmental documents prepared for the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations; **NOW, THEREFORE**,

BE IT ORDAINED that amendments to the Island County Comprehensive Plan, the Camp Casey Conference Center Master Plan, attached hereto as Exhibit A, Chapter 17.03 ICC, attached hereto as Exhibit B, and the Island County Zoning Atlas, attached hereto as Exhibit C, that establish the Camp Casey Conference Center Master Plan and implementing development regulations are hereby adopted. Material underlined is added.

Reviewed this 4 day of November, 2002 and set for public hearing at 10:30 a.m. on the 2 day of December, 2002.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST: Elaine Marlow, Clerk of the Board

Revised on Nov. 18th, 2002. See Inserted Page.

Reviewed this 18th day of Nov., 2002 and set for public meeting at 10:30 a.m. on the 16th day of December, 2002.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST: Ellen K. Meyer,
Deputy Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 16 day of December, 2002.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST:
Elaine Marlow, Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DAVID L. JAMIESON, JR.
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
& Island County Code Reviser *[Exhibits placed on file with the Clerk of the Board]*

HEARING HELD: RESOLUTION #C-106-02/PLG-024-02 AMENDING THE PLANNING & COMMUNITY

DEVELOPMENT BUILDING PERMIT FEE SCHEDULE

A Public Hearing, scheduled also for 10:30 a.m. on Resolution #C-106-02/PLG-024-02 Amending the Planning & Community development Building Permit Fee Schedule, was held immediately following completion of the public meeting on the Comprehensive Plan Amendments. Phil Bakke made the presentation on behalf of the Planning Department. The proposal reflects a 15% increase to the building permit fee schedule. He recalled that last year the Planning Department fee schedule and the Building Permit Valuation Schedule were amended. The fee schedule was not touched at that time, though it could have been raised as far back as 1994. Most neighboring jurisdictions either meet or surpass fees proposed under this Resolution.

No one in the audience spoke either for or against the proposed change in the fee schedule.

By unanimous motion, the Board adopted Resolution #C-106-02/PLG-024-02, Amending the Planning & Community development Building Permit Fee Schedule.

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

IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING THE PLANNING)	
& COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BUILDING)	RESOLUTION C-106-02
PERMIT FEE SCHEDULE)	PLG-024-02
)	

WHEREAS, the Island County Building Permit Fee Schedule has not been amended since the adoption of Resolution PLG-010-98; and

WHEREAS, the State Building Code Council (SBCC) adopted the 1994 Uniform Building Code in July of 1995 and included an increase of forty percent (40%) for building permit fees; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Island County Commissioners was not of the opinion that a forty percent increase in fees should be as sudden as proposed by the Uniform Building Code; and

WHEREAS, the Board resolved to increase fees five percent (5%) by PLG-063-93, PLG-029-94, PLG-045-95, PLG-037-96 and PLG-010-98; and

WHEREAS, the Board now intends to increase the Building Permit Fees by fifteen percent (15%) as shown on the attached fee schedule, Exhibit "A", to become effective as of January 1, 2003; and

WHEREAS, the Building Valuation Schedule was adjusted by Resolution C-170-01 on December 24, 2001 and is revised as shown in Exhibit "B", and

WHEREAS, the Board of Island County Commissioners also desires to continue the promotion of affordable housing for median income households as represented by a reduction in fees shown in Exhibit "C"; **NOW, THEREFORE,**

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Island County Commissioners that the Building Permit Fees be amended as attached hereto in Exhibit "A", the Building Valuation Schedule be adopted as shown in Exhibit "B" and the affordable housing fee reductions be continued as shown in Exhibit "C" all to be effective on January 1, 2003.

REVIEWED this 25 day of November, 2002, and set for Public Hearing on the 16 day of December, 2002, at 10:30 AM.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST: Elaine Marlow, Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 16 day of December, 2002.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman
Wm. L. McDowell, Member
William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST: Elaine Marlow,
Clerk of the Board *[Exhibits placed on file with the Clerk of the Board]*

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Board will be held on December 23, 2002, beginning at 11:30 a.m. with an Elected Officials Roundtable [Courthouse Administration Building, Room #116] and regular agenda items beginning at 1:30 p.m., Law & Justice Facility, Department III.

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

Mike Shelton, Chairman _____

Wm. L. McDowell, Member

William F. Thorn, Member

ATTEST: _____
Elaine Marlow, Clerk of the Board