

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
 COMMISSIONER'S HEARING ROOM, COUPEVILLE, WA  
 TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2014**

	<i>Members Present</i>	<i>Members Absent</i>
<i>District 1</i>	<i>Val Hillers – Chair</i>	
	<i>Dean Enell</i>	
	<i>Mike Joselyn – Vice Chair</i>	
<i>District 2</i>	<i>Jeffery Wallin</i>	
	<i>George Saul</i>	
	<i>Leal Dickson</i>	
<i>District 3</i>	<i>Wayne Havens</i>	
	<i>Beth Munson</i>	
	<i>Scott Yonkman</i>	

Meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m. by Chair Hillers.

**ROLL CALL**

Mike Joselyn, Wayne Havens, Beth Munson, Leal Dickson, Val Hillers, Dean Enell, Scott Yonkman, Jeffery Wallin, George Saul

**Minutes:**

NONE

Planning staff present: David Wechner – Planning Director, Will Simpson – Long Range Planner

**ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC**

NONE

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

NONE

**NEW BUSINESS –**

Findings and Recommendation-Proposed amendments to Chapter 17.03 ICC, designating land use application type, definitions and establishing development standards for the regulation of I-502 (recreational marijuana) uses in several zones of the County. (DRA 049/14).

Dave Wechner presented a brief outline of I-502. He has received some written testimony which he wanted to note for the record and has been forwarded to the Planning Commission. Also discussed the written public comments received.

This is a public hearing to consider proposed amendments to the zoning code to allow recreational marijuana uses specifically authorized by Initiative 502 in the provisions in Washington Administrative Code 314.55 those rules were proposed by the Liquor Control Board were sent to the County in draft form in June of last year and have received a second draft in September in the final set of rules in October of 2013. The Board of County Commissioners responded to that by passing an emergency ordinance allowing a temporary moratorium on I-502 uses that is allowed by the Planning Enabling Act and State Growth Management Act. The

Boards primary purpose in doing so is to give us time to coordinate with other communities on the Island and do their own zoning and comp plan designations; specifically Oak Harbor and Langley. This is brand new land use in the state of Washington and to assess more of the public reaction from voters and it was noted in a couple of workshops that 55% of Island County voters, voted in favor of I-502. With the new state rules coming into effect in October of 2013 and applications being taken by Liquor Control Board as early as November 2013, the Board decided to pass a moratorium and get the County some breathing room and chance to fully flush out the issues before making any ordinance provisions for land use. Staff proposes to adopt a new section of the land use development standards of Chapter 17.03.180 to address I-502 uses. Other portions of that code which are land use development standards are all centered on particular uses. The land use development standards focus on particular types of uses and what kind of development standards those might entail. Examples include home occupations, small scale and recreation and tourist uses, surface mining and a wide range of things that are contained in 17.03.180, which currently have subsections A-Z, AA and now proposing BB. Planning Commission has met in workshop several times to discuss the approach to an ordinance; we are proposing that as the sort of way to affect the structure of the code, to address I-502 uses. It also entails making changes to individual zoning districts to identify where I-502 uses will be permitted, conditional or prohibited uses.

In November 2013, the Board enacted the moratorium and we are here tonight to discuss with the Public in and open Public Hearing the most appropriate zones to locate it. There are three categories of uses identified in Washington Administrative Code that were referred to producer, processor and retailer. Those are defined in Washington Administrative Code, there is also a definition proposed for the zoning code that reiterates those definitions. The producer category has three tiers, those of production that are less than two thousand square feet in size, those that are two thousand to ten thousand square feet in size and those ten thousand to thirty thousand square feet in size, these tiers are reiterated in the proposed ordinance provisions. On a state wide level the current rule is two million square feet, that is about forty five to forty six acres of size for the state in its entirety for the purpose of recreational marijuana. The proposed ordinance provisions do not address medicinal marijuana which is covered in a separate RWC, 69.51.A. The Board decided that for medicinal marijuana growing and production which most often occurs in collective grows was not something they wanted to address, this is strictly recreational marijuana, subject to I-502 and the Washington Administrative Code 314.55. There are a few restrictions inherent in the WAC that are simply reiterated or clarified in the proposed ordinance, for example, the WAC restricts such business to be located within a residence, it does not allow it. The proposed ordinance would not allow I-502 uses to be conducted as a home occupation or home industry; residential use of the property is the primary land use. The proposed provisions are presented for public hearing and discussion they are not set in their current format or structure. He stated that the hearing set tonight is to listen to public testimony, consider written testimony received and make any revision deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission to address public concerns. As proposed the primary zone where production and processing uses would occur is the Rural Zone which is the most prevalent zone in the County. The Airport and Light Manufacturing Zones are allowed use zones as well, those zones within the UGA of Oak Harbor reflect their current ordinance amendments to allow these uses their planning commission and their council have been considering I-502 as well and primarily sought to put them in the Industrial and Industrial Park Zones for production and processing and they have one retail zone called C-4 and that is where retail sales will occur in Oak Harbor. As part

of the State rules that were propagated by Liquor Control Board, there is one retail license application, they focused at allocating retail license application throughout the State in both counties and municipalities, and one license application for retail is allocated to Oak Harbor and four for the County at large including Langley.

Langley pointed out in their written comments, which were not received until after the staff report and proposed amendments had gone out that most of their UGA lands are residential and would like to be consistent with the County Ordinance. At this time the designation be reflected as much as the County is prohibiting I-502 uses in Rural Residential Zone to make that reflection at the Langley UGA as well.

Agriculture and Forest Zones are not currently target for I-502 uses, they were not addressed as Planning Commission expressed some concern usurping land based agriculture with what are likely to be indoor grow operations and light manufacturing, however, if the Planning Commission deems appropriate after hearing public testimony it is relatively simple to make the same kind of designations within Agriculture and Forest Zones as done in the Rural Zone. For retail sales the County proposes that it occur in existing zones that allow other retail uses. Citing of all I-502 uses, it is further subject to restrictions of the WAC 314.55, which restricts their placement within a thousand feet of public assembly type uses, schools, community service centers, for youth and parks.

One of the issues that was brought up in some of the written testimony and the workshops was how to characterize marijuana uses whether it be an agricultural use or more of a manufacturing use as most drugs are not considered necessarily agricultural uses. It is a higher level of production and processing perhaps for the drug manufacturing and certain products where marijuana can be infused into other types of things within the Liquor Control Board rules of WAC 314.55. Even though the staff is not proposing at this time to include marijuana production and processing as an agricultural use, would like to make the distinction it could be allowed in the Agricultural Zones, but subject to the land use development standards of 17.03.180. One of the reasons that it is proposed is some of the discussions had in the Planning Commission workshops and before the Board and in some of the discussions had with the members of the public where they would like adjacent neighbors to have some notice of an activity, Type II land uses do require a posting of a notice of the land use application which invites public comment and can be appealed by neighbors that might have an opposition to the location of the use of the property, the existence of the use on the property or other standards that they have to adhere to as conditions of the permit. Type III uses are also allowed that are primarily focused on production at the Tier III level greater than ten thousand square feet, that is a fairly large production facility that may create more traffic, more potential impacts to neighbors and in a Type III use that is a Quasi-Judicial hearing which goes before the Island County Hearing Examiner. Agricultural uses typically are not subject to that level of scrutiny or public notice and comment, the Planning Commission had a consensus that they would like to have that degree of review as the intensity of these uses grows.

Commissioner Hillers announced to the public to sign a testimony card in order to have accurate contact information when they speak in front of the Planning Commission.

Director Wechner gave further explanation of the testimony card procedure.

Commissioner Yonkman asked for clarification that marijuana can be produced and processed in the Ag zone and is permissible, but needs to be made clear that it is not considered an agricultural product. It is considered a controlled substance and this makes the product different from typical agriculture.

Dave Wechner said it would be treated differently if it were a type I, II, III use and a distinct definition, yes. What is being proposed is a distinct definition from agricultural products due to some of the findings that are laid out on the proposed findings to the Planning Commission. In page four of the proposed findings to the Planning Commission, while marijuana is a plant species the Planning Commission finds the uses allowed under I-502 are distinguished from and unlike other plants grown or processed as agricultural practices for products for the following reasons: Production, processing, retail sale of marijuana subject to product tracking, tracking accounting state licensing, and security measures unlike any other agricultural product in the state of Washington. It is most similar to drug manufacturing and cannot be sold, transferred similar to all other agricultural products, such as an agricultural farm stand. The result of production, processing of marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to the Federal Control Substances Act at this time. Most but not all production of marijuana is expected to be hydroponic or grown inside. Most commercial growing operations will not be done as land based agriculture, there is no restriction against outdoor grows as proposed in the code. Recreational marijuana may not be sold or traded at farm stands, farmers markets, on site at agricultural farms, or illegally transported out of the state like all other agricultural products. Those are some of the main distinctions between them.

Commissioner Havens asked for an explanation between a growing and a processing separation.

Director Wechner stated that those are allowed to occur together, it is the retail that is not allowed to occur on the same location. He also pointed to the zones that allow the marijuana growth and the other variance zones in Island County. Rural Service zone is also being recommended to be permitted as an allowed use zone. He also showed the Planning Commissioners the locations on the zoning maps where the proposed locations would be.

Commissioner Hillers asked for the distinction of Commercial Agriculture on the zoning maps.

Commissioner Yonkman asked for the boundaries of Ebey's Reserve to be pointed out.

Commissioner Enell asked if all the land on Ebey's Reserve has all of the same zoning.

Dave responded that it did not and further read the existing zoning within Ebey's Reserve.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

### **Jason Hicks, 3300 Old Goldie Rd, Oak Harbor**

He stated that the document as a whole is praise worthy particularly with regards to the manufacturing of drugs, the security that is required, his concerns are just technical. The zoning maps that are being presented are outdated from 2005 and some zoning has changed since then

within the Oak Harbor UGA but within Island County there are light manufacturing uses also. His concern is that the City of Oak Harbor might have some conflict with the UGA even though it is outside of the City limits, there are few of those light manufacturing parcels in Island County that are also in the UGA and hopes that they will be included within the permitted uses for the Type I and II decisions for producing and processing. Second concern is just a technical concern in the new section BB paragraph 2 section D all outdoor processing activities and loading areas shall be screened from the view of adjacent residential uses and setback from the property not less than 30 feet. He feels that the language is redundant because the WAC 314 for those types of activities requires an 8 foot fence, so it is pretty much a wall. He feels the language that says that it needs to be screened is redundant by the state law, since it is required by state law, feels that the 30 foot setback is not necessary.

**Wilbur Bishop, 1520 Hill Road, Coupeville**

He wanted to clarify the sign at Juan de Fuca is not the entrance of Ebey's Reserve; the entrance is over at the Rolling Hills Area. Looking at the Reserve in the Ordinance it would not allow it in Commercial Ag and Rural Forest he thinks that's great. Almost all of the Commercial Ag, less than 50 acres already are protected with easements on it, either by national parks, Whidbey Camano Land Trust. He owns 8 acres that are not protected, his neighbor owns 20 acres that is not protected, and in the Coupeville Schools is another piece that is not protected. So he doesn't think that it needs to be. He feels that it should not be allowed in the Forestry zone since this is not forestry as far as he is concerned. In the County, the big market share is in Rural zone, in Ebey's Reserve there is a lesser amount of Rural property as there is compared to the rest of the County. He pointed out that taking a look at the how much of that is owned by the County, the State, or has easements on it; a lot of those properties would already be restricted. His issue with the ordinance as it is, is the section on Ebey's Reserve, it sets precedence, if it's not on farmland it is dictating what a farmer can grow or not grow, it can still have trends using the Reserve boundaries for dictating policy other than the purpose of those boundaries. If it's a social issue, defense or law enforcement, that is not the purpose of the Reserve either. If you start using the Reserve Boundaries and set the precedence other than the purpose of the reserve it will be a bad situation down the road.

**Becky Spraitzar, 37353 SR 20, Oak Harbor**

She would like the Planning Commission to consider industrial hemp growth. There are a lot of uses for industrial hemp, she is mostly considered about the north end of Whidbey Island, the land has been restricted because of the Naval Air Station and has verified with the Navy that industrial hemp is an approved crop in those areas near the Naval Air Station. She really thinks that the Planning Commission should take a look at that, she understands that this is in a different code and it's not the I-502 issue, and this is an opportunity that people would be able to make a living on their property and there is a lot of it that is zoned rural but there are also the exceptions that they can have a special use permit.

Commissioner Hillers responded that there was a question at one of the workshops about where industrial hemp fit. A newspaper article described Washington House Bill 1888 for industrial hemp production. She asked if the bill had been approved. She thanked Ms. Spraitzar for bringing it to the attention of the Planning Commission even though it is not a part of I-502.

**Kristen Griffin, Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve Manager, Box 774, Coupeville**

She would like to acknowledge the work staff and the Planning Commission have put into this Ordinance and complex issue. She wanted to mention that due to the proposed draft regulation does specifically name the Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve, the Trust Board has some concerns in that area, and it appears that some opportunities to engage with the workshop process did not occur. The Trust Board is interested to have some kind of public process on their own, especially to relate to users of the Reserve and farmers, many who have easements that are managed by the Trust Board. She just wanted to bring it to the attention of the Commission.

Commissioner Hillers asked Ms. Griffin that what she is asking for is to do some information gathering to bring back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

Ms. Griffin stated that was what she is asking for.

**Josh Frank Harvey, 709 Edgefield Lane, Coupeville**

He sent a comment letter to the Planning Commission and most of his information is in that. He grew up here on Whidbey Island and all what he wanted to do was to leave Whidbey Island. He remembered one time telling his father, that he referred to Seattle as his home and he just stopped him and said no Whidbey Island is his home. So this 502 is giving him the opportunity to come to the island, to start a business and start a farm. Yet proposing a ban on processing that would greatly impact his business. In his business plan submitted to the Liquor Control Board the extent of the processing would be trimming, drying, weighing bagging, and labelling, they have no plans on using chemical solvents to breakdown or manufacture any products. This means no hash oils, hash, tinctures, and edibles, any of that stuff. Their plan is to use strictly organic methods, organic fertilizers, and dirt to grow their product. Lastly, he is concerned with the Reserve as well, about putting restrictions on what he can do on his property, he feels there are already safeguards there, and it seems a little unfair.

Commissioner Enell asked what his property is zoned.

Mr. Harvey stated he is zoned Rural Agriculture.

**Esther Bandelin Rodriguez, 693 Edgefield Lane, Coupeville**

She would like to address Finding E; she would like the Planning Commission to reassess its findings. This is the finding that talks about marijuana and its uses allowed under I-502 are distinguished from and unlike other plants grown and processed as agricultural practices. She would like to read what Washington state legislature has defined under RCW 49.17.020 as farming and includes but is not limited to the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the function cultivation and growing harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodity, the raising of livestock, fur-bearing animals or poultry and any practice performed by a farmer or on a farm. Some of the topics had were, all products in Washington state are subject to tracking, accounting, state licensing and security at varying levels. One thing that was written by the Planning Commission was mussels in Penn Cove and mussels are tracked from farm all the way to sale and so that is a highly tracked agricultural product. It was discussed that most cannabis is grown hydroponically, but that is arbitrary because almost any plant that grows in soil can be

grown hydroponically; also mussels are grown in water straight out of Penn Cove. She wanted to state that the majority of crops grown in the Reserve are not sold in a farmers market. Some are grown for fuel and most are sold overseas, to add that just because it cannot be sold in a farmers market doesn't mean it is not agriculture and it shouldn't be treated differently. That also relates to Finding I, it was stated that agriculture is primarily a land use activity, and with the mussels that is not true.

**Judy Harvey, PO Box 429, Coupeville**

She has lived on Ebey's Historic Reserve for 34 years, and she owns approximately 20 acres. Her husband put 13.5 acres into the care of the Whidbey Camano Land Trust before his passing. She does not support the County adding additional regulations on the farmer of Ebey's Reserve, it is unnecessary and unfair burden, economic disadvantages, to Ebey's landowners and farmers, she has several signed letters from her neighbors, which are all in the Reserve, and citizens of Whidbey Island, to give to the Planning Commission, and they feel the same way about setting new regulations.

Dave Wechner addressed a few of the concerns raised by the public:

- Can an 8 foot fence be built? Yes with a building permit, a 7 foot fence does not require a building permit. If the Planning Commission wanted to allow 8 foot fences that would not require a building permit, an adjustment to the County Code would be required. Right now you can build an 8 foot fence with a building permit. Within the Ebey's Reserve a fence over 6 feet would require a design review.
- Wilbur Bishop mentioned there are some additional protections in the Ebey's Reserve. They have design standards within it, they dictate how structures look, fencing, and other design characteristics in placement of structures in proximity to historic structures. There is a Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), which also looks at applications for building structures and land uses, mostly structures within Ebey's Reserve, there is a different level of design scrutiny that is taken for those particular uses.
- Becky Spritzer, asked the Planning Commission to consider industrial hemp, and as she stated it is not covered under I-502 and would not be addressed in tonight's hearing but is noted in the record and the Planning Commission has acknowledged that is an issue they would like to address in the future and will keep an eye on House Bill 1888.
- There were some distinctions made by the public regarding recreational marijuana as an agricultural use and as I stated before public testimony began, there are Agricultural Zones, Forest Zones and the Rural Zones which is the most prevalent zone in the County. There are more intensive industrial and manufacturing zones and commercial areas. Currently in the County Zoning Code if there is a use that is not specifically listed within the zone, it is not necessarily prohibited. That is a provision found in a lot of zoning codes. The provision is called prescriptive zoning, if you are listed as an actual use; if your use is not listed within the zone it is presumed to be prohibited until you add it to the zone. Island County Code has a provision that allows you through a separate process to

establish that use within the zone even though the use is not listed. He had a previous conversation earlier week with the Prosecuting Attorney's office that suggested that it might behoove us to actually identify each of the zones, whether we want to permit (and at which level) and whether we want to prohibit for each of the zones including Agricultural and Forest Zones. And I have to agree with him. That does lend more specificity and more concreteness to the decision that staff and me would make in the future if we did have someone that wanted to come in to apply in one of those zones where it is not specifically listed as an allowed use. That does save a step in the process.

Commissioner Hillers stated that they would like to aim for maximum clarity. She closed the Public testimony.

Commissioner Enell stated he is in favor of removing Finding I. He believes it would hinder the area; and believes in preserving the Reserve and not affecting it financially. In looking at the finding it looks pretty restrictive. He does not think that Ebey's Reserve should have added restrictions. But he does agree there are certain limitations, like preserving historic buildings and different sorts of view features and things like that.

Commissioner Wallin asked if the WAC addresses federally protected lands.

Director Wechner stated it is not addressed.

Commissioner Dickson addressed the public concern regarding Ebey's Reserve restrictions and supports Commissioner Enell's ideas. He would like to know why initially it was singled out. He asked if it was due to state regulations or because there is a thought that there is something special in Ebey's Reserve.

David Wechner responded that the thoughts and feelings of the Board of Commissioners was a concern to a varying degree about the allowance of recreational marijuana uses within Ebey's Reserve and the impacts that may occur. Ebey's Reserve is a prime tourist draw for the area. Impacts like traffic to the area need to be considered. He was never given direction to strike Ebey's Reserve from the ordinance; in a forum like this is the perfect time to sort out how the public feels about that. The Board felt that there were some inconsistencies with the purposes of the Reserve. Whether a brand new land use sort of untested ground was the place to do that, the Board has some reticence. There are several different zones within Ebey's Reserve, would marijuana retail be appropriate in the entrance of Ebey's Reserve.

Commissioner Munson wanted to recommend that Kristen Griffin, representing Ebey's Reserve bring in information from the farmers in Ebey's Reserve.

Commissioner Hillers stated that there are a number of letters from the farmers from the Reserve weighing in their concern and it is pretty clear that they do not like the idea of being singled out under this ordinance.

Commissioner Dickson agreed with the sentiment.

Commissioner Hillers asked Kristen Griffin to speak in regards to what the Trust Board would like to do. She also opened up the public comment period to allow Ms. Griffin to speak.

Kirsten wanted to be clear that the Trust Board instructed her to state that they really haven't had a chance to consider what this might mean for the reserve, it's the void of the feedback that they need that they have asked her to speak about today. It seems the Planning Commission has received feedback that she has not necessarily had but the Reserve Trust Board would like to have the chance, since it is specifically tied to the Reserve's boundaries, to hear at a public trust board meeting what that might mean for the Reserve and its users.

Commissioner Hillers stated that the Board of Island County Commissioners is eager to get this off of moratorium status. She asked Ms. Griffin for a timing of her proposal.

Ms. Griffin stated that their next meeting is March 25, 2014 and would just like to have an opportunity to have an advertised Trust Board meeting to allow people to address the Trust Board.

Dave Wechner stated that would be the day that Planning Commission would continue this meeting for March 25, 2014. He also stated that the meeting would be at 9:00 a.m. because if the meeting is at a different time or date, it is a special session meeting and there might be conflicts with this room and the meeting would need to be re-advertised. He also wanted to remind the Planning Commission that there is a bit of a time frame that they are working within, the 6month moratorium is good until May 13, 2014. It is on the proposed schedule to have it to the Board on April 7, 2014, any findings conclusions and ordinance recommendations of the Planning Commission need to be signed before they are forwarded to the Board, if there is any extra editing that needs to be done before the 25<sup>th</sup>. It is his goal to have something in the books by mid or late April.

Further discussion of the Trust Board meeting before the Planning Commission meeting continued.

Kristen stated she would like to discuss the details with Dave Wechner. She stated they would make it a priority to work on this as quickly as possible.

Public comment was closed by Commissioner Hillers.

Commissioner Enell asked that Finding I be rewritten to address the concern of the Reserve.

Commissioner Yonkman is in support of not restricting the Forest Zone in the Reserve. But do they need to be careful of creating potential conflict.

Dave Wechner responded that Historic Reserve is an overlay zone. Any restrictions that happen in the Forest Zones, would apply to the entire County.

Commissioner Enell commented regarding the concern whether marijuana is an agricultural product or not and it was decided that it was not. He asked what have other jurisdictions done regarding this matter.

David Wechner said Skagit, Snohomish did not consider it an agricultural use. Whatcom considered it an agricultural use. There are some marijuana production facilities that will be located within the industrial districts of Seattle. East of the Cascades, it may primarily be outdoor growing operations. He thinks it is not land dependent like most agricultural uses are.

Commissioner Yonkman discussed Frank Harvey's comment regarding fully organic provisions and are there reduced restrictions or special allowances if something is fully an organic product.

Dave Wechner read the zoning provisions as they are currently proposed; he used the Rural Zone as an example since it is the most prevalent zone in the County. He also referenced the Type and Tier requirements and the distinctions made by the Liquor Control Board.

Commissioner Hillers recognizes what the public is saying that it should be considered an agricultural crop but the State WAC says otherwise. She has mixed feelings about Ebey's being restricted and would like to see what the Trust Board presents to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Enell had an additional comment to the Director of the Trust Board, the typical conservation easements that Trust Board has placed on properties, would they be allowed to grow marijuana on those properties.

Discussion regarding the placement of easements was discussed amongst the Planning Commissioners and opened the public comment to allow Kristen Griffin to further explain those easement restrictions.

Kristen stated that there are a variety of conservation easements on the properties on the Reserve. Even among on the easements that are national Park Service, they are not all identical and are a complex patchwork.

Commissioner Hillers felt that the appropriate thing to do is go to recess and continue the Hearing to March 25, 2014.

David Wechner wanted to poll the Planning Commission and be clear in making changes to the proposed ordinance between now and the, comeback to them with a clean copy of what he thinks represents their feelings on it. If any changes are made to the continued Hearing they would be limited at best.

Commissioner Hillers wanted clarity under definitions under marijuana manufacturer it talks about practitioner, does practitioner need to be defined.

Commissioner Enell stated he would like to see being that marijuana is not classified as an agricultural product, will that have any inhibitions/restrictions and make it more difficult for someone to get a permit.

Commissioner Hillers asked for Agricultural and Forest Zone to be added into the approved areas.

Will Simpson read the definition of Rural Forest Zone and further explained the definition.

Dave Wechner read the purpose statement and permitted uses in a Rural Forest Zone, zone citation 17.03.110.

Discussion regarding the permitted uses in a Rural Forest Zone carried on amongst the Planning Commissioners and the Planning Director.

Dave Wechner read into the record the correspondence received from the following citizens; e-mail from Josh Harvey received 3/9/14, letter dated 3/6/14 received 3/10 from Charles Arndt, e-mail received from Holli Hanson on 3/8/14, Jeff Arango from the City of Langley on 3/10/14, e-mail received on 3/9/14 and 3/10/14 from Wilbur Bishop, and a letter from 2/24/14 signed by various Reserve farmers. At this time staff would appreciate the opportunity to make some of the changes that the Planning Commission has requested for Ag Zones and Forest Zones, will wait to hear from the Trust Board before they make a specific change to the Ebey's Reserve provision but recognize that there are some concerns in that regard and some objections to there being extra restrictions in the Ebey's Reserve. He also requested that the Hearing be continued to March 25, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. in the Board of County Commissioner's Hearing Room. There will be a notice posted on the County website announcing the continuation of the Hearing. He would also like to come back to the Planning Commission after speaking to the Langley staff and Oak Harbor staff to make sure that the ordinances match fairly well in how they are written, the Comp Plan and ordinance development matches those provisions within their Urban Growth Areas.

*Commissioner Wallin moved to continue the Hearing to March 25, 2014 at 9:00 a.m., Commissioner Enell seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

Meeting adjourned at 7:50pm.  
Respectfully submitted,

Virginia Shaddy