

**ISLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
SUMMARY MINUTES,  
COMMISSIONER'S HEARING ROOM, COUPEVILLE, WA  
Tuesday May 12, 2009**

	<b>Members Present</b>	<b>Members Absent</b>
<b>District 1</b>	<b>Val Hillers</b>	
	<b>Ray Gabelein</b>	
	<b>Mike Joselyn</b>	
<b>District 2</b>	<b>Terry Reynolds</b>	
		<b>Rex Porter</b>
		<b>Mahmoud Abdel-Monem</b>
<b>District 3</b>	<b>Wayne Havens</b>	
	<b>Bill Lippens</b>	
	<b>Scott Yonkman</b>	

**Roll Call**

Val Hillers, Wayne Havens, Mike Joselyn, Ray Gabelein, Terry Reynolds, Scott Yonkman, Bill Lippens.

Staff Present: Anthony Boscolo, Long Range Planner, Brandon Sweeza, Long Range Planner, Long Range Planning Consultant, Jeff Tate

**Approval of Minutes**

February 24, 2009

*Commissioner Terry Reynolds moved to accept the minutes as written, Commissioner Mike Joselyn seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

February 27, 2009

*Commissioner Mike Joselyn moved to accept the minutes as written, Commissioner Scott Yonkman seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

Anthony Boscolo provided an introduction to the 2009 docket and the process.

Jeff Tate provided a briefing for the Ebey's Reserve development regulations set for hearings in June. The County has an appointed citizen Historic Review Committee that reviews development applications within the reserve. The Town of Coupeville also has an appointed citizen Design Review Board that reviews proposals within the town. The objective is to better coordinate the activities within the Reserve.

Currently there is very little formal coordination between the Town of Coupeville and the County in terms of the rules, procedures and opinions of how things should be implemented. The customers building within the Reserve must learn two sets of regulations and two sets of procedures and the Reserve citizens also have to learn two different sets of expectations in terms of how business is done.

The 2009 docket item for Ebey's Reserve development regulations will attempt to create a better and more efficient system with a more user friendly set of regulations. The target date for the draft proposal is June 1<sup>st</sup> for transmittal to the Planning Commission.

Mark Preiss, Reserve Manager for the Trust Board of Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve provided his point of view on the joint process. The last six months have seen the compilation of all of the different concepts from community members, farmers, business owners, owners of historic properties and the two planning departments. The objective as partners is to leverage the resources and assets to create a system that makes better sense, is practical and will allow a person, no matter where they are within the Reserve to have the same process.

Island County, the Town of Coupeville, the National Park Service and Washington State Parks were bound together in 1988 to form the Trust Board. The intention was for that local control to be a part of the management of this Reserve and the design review is an important resource to protect our resources and heritage.

The Trust Board submitted a challenge grant to the National Parks Service last fall, which competed against the Pacific West Region to support this design review process and partnership. It was ranked the number one project in the pacific west because of this partnership and the importance of the project.

Mr. Tate stated this was a different and unique process. The draft proposal will be advanced to both the Island County Planning Commission and the Town of Coupeville Planning Commission at the same time in a joint meeting. There will be recognition of the difference between the Town and the County, but the hearings will be held jointly for the two planning commissions.

Ultimately the recommendations will be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners and the Town Council who will in turn hold joint meetings.

A design manual will also be developed and advanced with visual examples included to better demonstrate the concepts. The Code amendments will be provided first and then followed up at the second hearing by the draft design manual.

Commissioner Wayne Havens asked how large the reserve was.

Commissioner Val Hillers stated it is 17,000 acres in size, which includes Penn Cove.

### **Items from the Public**

There were none

### **Amendments to the 2006 Island County Non-Motorized Plan**

Hand-outs:

- Staff Report
- Map of North Whidbey Island
- Map of Central Whidbey Island
- Map of South Whidbey Island

Joantha Guthrie from Island County Public Works provided the presentation. The original Plan was adopted in 2006 after input from the community. The Plan is not about recreational trails it is about moving people without using automobiles, focusing on transportation, not recreation.

The proposed amendment has a long term vision of having a non-motorized trail all the way from Deception Pass Bridge to the Clinton Ferry Dock. The Plan would provide the ability of doing a multi-use trail like the one that currently joins Fort Ebey State Park and the Kettles property to the Town of Coupeville. The objective is to get people to destinations without having to get in a vehicle. It has to do with people riding horses, bicycles and walking.

Several projects have been identified in the last two years, but until the Non-Motorized Trails Plan is amended to include all these areas, funding would not be available. Two or three sections in Freeland have been identified and Public Works would like to apply for funding to move people between Freeland and Bayview. Rather than adding small projects as they come up, the concept of adding the whole corridor was decided upon because it is the long term vision.

Bicycle riders add tens of thousands of dollars in revenue to the community and millions to the State every year and building multi-use trails is the main goal in the Trails Plan.

Commissioner Havens asked if there were restrictions related to skate boarding.

Ms. Guthrie stated there was not. It would allow all non-motorized traffic, roller skates, scooters, skate boards etc.

Commissioner Gabelein asked whether roundabouts were studied in the Non-Motorized Trails Plan in relation to how they work with pedestrian movement.

Ms. Guthrie replied that it was not part of this. There are several areas that present separate challenges and will need to be addressed. Roundabouts will be one of those issues that will need to be looked at.

Commissioner Yonkman asked about the statement that bicyclers bring revenue to the island and asked if that referred to formal events or whether it was bicyclers spending as they were touring.

Ms. Guthrie replied it was both. The north part of the island from Deception Pass Bridge to the Port Townsend Ferry is on almost every traveling bicycle web site and map that is part of a route going from British Columbia down to south of Whidbey Island.

Chair Gabelein opened the hearing for public comment on the Island County Public Works amendment for the 2006 Non-Motorized Trails Plan.

**Steve Erickson**, Whidbey Environmental Action Network

Asked what the standard width for non-motorized trails were as well as the separation from the highway.

Ms. Guthrie replied the standard width WashDOT requires is eight to ten feet depending on the location.

Mr. Erickson provided comments on the portion of the Plan that was already adopted, expressing concern about many areas and discussing items such as cutting hazard trees, weeds growing in the horse drop off areas and maintenance of those areas.

Commissioner Hillers asked for a clarification for the record that most of the issues discussed were in areas already adopted and the amendment under consideration was to put the trail down State Route 20.

Ms. Guthrie confirmed Commissioner Hillers was correct.

Chair Gabelein closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

A two week public comment period was determined for the Non-Motorized Trails Plan to end at 4:30 p.m. May 26, 2009.

### **Public Utility Segregation**

Hand-outs:

Transmittal and Report Memorandum

Proposed Amendments to 17.03.090 Rural Agriculture (RA) Zone

Proposed Amendments to 17.03.110 Rural Forest (RF) Zone

Planner Brandon Sweeza provided an introductory presentation on the amendment to exempt electric utility facilities from property segregation review pursuant to State Code. He explained RCW 58.17.040 would be incorporated into the County Code to make the County's rules more consistent with Washington State Law.

The facility and site must meet the following requirements:

1. The lot or tract created must be less than three acres.
2. It has to be an unstaffed facility, with the exception of security.
3. The facility must be used for transmission, distribution, sale or furnishing of electricity
4. The facility must provide service to existing and new customers.

Essentially this Code is being taken from State Law and being inserted into the County's Ordinance as an exemption from the subdivision chapter. The ultimate goal is to bring Island County Code into better consistency with Washington State Law.

Commissioner Lippens asked if under State law this is allowed to be done or required.

Mr. Tate replied that it was not mandatory to be included, but that typically the County tried to align the exemptions rooted in State Law to be carried forward into the County Code.

Chair Ray Gabelein opened the floor to public comment.

### **Steve Erickson, WEAN**

Stated there were two concerns with the first being procedural. If it is exempt from subdivision ordinance how will it be routed through to make sure the other zoning requirements are followed.

If the utility use is abandoned or becomes unnecessary, is that lot vested as a substandard lot for residential use. It is unclear if that would be permissible. He said he has proposed some language to avoid that in his written comments.

**Marian Edain, WEAN**

Stated it is allowed, but not required, is this needed in Island County. Said her question was if the County was going to align itself with the State because it is allowed and whether Island County truly needed this.

**Al Williams, 1875 Fort Nugent Rd**

Mr. Williams stated that PSE was sold to a foreign outfit and their concerns may not be our concerns. He stated that he hoped whatever rules or regulations imposed would require the unused portion of the property require controlling noxious weeds.

Mr. Tate stated one of the reasons why this issue has come before the Planning Commission is due to a request on Camano by Snohomish PUD, who were in a position of looking at five acre parcels and asked why the County's Code wasn't in alignment with State law as it is a lot more expensive to buy five acres when only an acre parcel was needed.

Chair Gabelein closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

**Essential Public Facilities**

Hand-outs:

- Transmittal and Report Memorandum
- Proposed Amendments to 17.03.060 Rural (R) Zone
- Proposed Amendments to 17.03.070 Rural Residential (RR) Zone
- Proposed Amendments to 17.03.090 Rural Agriculture (RA) Zone
- Proposed Amendments to 17.03.100 Commercial Agriculture (CA) Zone
- Proposed Amendments to 17.03.110 Rural Forest (RF) Zone
- Proposed Amendments to 16.06.030 Applicability

Brandon Sweeza provided a briefing on the amendments to Essential Public Facilities. To allow essential public facilities to be conditionally permitted in the Rural Forest and the Rural Agricultural zones.

What are essential public facilities?

- ◆ These are facilities that provide a service to the public and are required to serve basic social needs of the community, but are difficult to site because they may require an extremely large amount of acreage.
- ◆ They have aesthetic issues.
- ◆ They create high impacts to transportation, noise, odor, and lighting and may involve high security requirements.
- ◆ They are broken down into two classifications in Island County Code.
  - There is a Class A facility that serves a large region or state, such as regional transportation facility, state correction and state education and

require a large size because of the impacts they have on the site and surroundings.

- Class B facilities serve the county or smaller regions or neighborhoods that need to be located near the areas they serve, such as solid waste handling, public schools, group homes and larger in-patient uses.

The amendment is being proposed as it is necessary to bring Island County Code into consistency with the Island County Comprehensive Plan. Under section IV, the Goals and Policies Section of the Island County Comprehensive Plan, has explicit language that Essential Public Facilities shall be allowed in the Rural Agricultural and Rural Forest zones.

Island County Code however, does not include Essential Public Facilities as being allowed in these zones.

Chair Gabelein opened the floor to public comment

**Marian Edain, WEAN**

Stated she sees the intent is to make the Ordinance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, she suggests the Planning Commission make the Comprehensive Plan consistent with the Ordinance. She said she understands the needs of the essential public facilities, but doesn't see them as being appropriate in the Rural Ag and Rural Forest zones.

**GayLynn Beighton, 2507 West Beach Rd.**

Suggested if this goes forward and is determined to be the best for Island County that these uses are only allowed in these zones if in fact there are no appropriate locations in the urban zones. All locations in the urban zones with the proper infrastructure should be exhausted first, suggesting a tiered process to protect the natural resources.

Chair Gabelein closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

**Personal Storage Facilities**

Hand-outs:

- Transmittal and Report Memorandum
- Exhibit A, Proposed Amendments to 17.03.180.C Land Use Standards
- Exhibit B, Law Incident Table
- Exhibit C, Table of 911 calls for current Personal Storage Facilities
- Exhibit D, Property Sales Analysis of Surrounding Properties

Brandon Sweeza provided the briefing, stating this amendment was slightly different. The Department is seeking guidance from the Planning Commission. There are two options available.

1. Amend the requirements for Personal Storage in the Rural zone to be more stringent and address the public concerns raised in the past.
2. Striking the use in the Rural zone from County Code and the Island County Comprehensive Plan

Personal Storage Facilities are currently a Conditional Use in the Rural zone. Applications for these receive significant public comment and testimony opposing placement in the Rural zone.

1. Concerned about increased crime.
2. Devaluation of surrounding properties.
3. Increased traffic.
4. A feeling that they are inappropriate for this zone.

An analysis was done and was shown in Exhibits B and C of the Staff Report.

Crime was analyzed from Sherriff's Reports for four properties and it did not indicate an increase in crime from before the facility was located on a site to after it had been there as a direct correlation to the facility.

The Assessors property sales data showed the facilities did not have an effect on the valuation of the surrounding properties within a quarter mile of a ten year period. The data showed the properties were all consistent with the patterns seen throughout the county.

The proposed amendments would provide more screening to reduce the impact on the surroundings.

- ◆ Additional screening would be required for outdoor storage.
- ◆ Addressing the public safety concerns would require a 24 hour a day caretaker residence to be on site, located at the main entrance, designed like a house and may be used as one of the methods to screen the facility.
- ◆ To require exterior video security cameras and an alarm system to be installed on the premises to monitor all the storage lockers.
- ◆ Security fencing would be required.
- ◆ Restricting the hours of operation from 6 a.m. to 12 a.m. would curb the potential for some of the crime issues.

Chair Gabelein opened the floor for public comment on this issue.

**Greg Donahue**, 3916 Lambsrest Lane, Greenbank

His association had a concern not addressed here, in addition to the rural natural aspect and the impact storage causes they are concerned about the children in the neighborhood. The facility brings strangers into the neighborhood. He feels this is a commercial enterprise and does not seem to go with rural areas.

This use stands apart from all other non-residential uses allowed in Rural zones in terms of impact and review process. To develop a home art studio on his property he would be allowed 800 sq. ft. to get a 200 sq. ft variance the process would be a level III review. In contrast 28,000 sq. ft of storage would be allowed on the same size parcel with only a small blurb in the newspaper with a two week notice and no public hearing. The amendments address some of the concerns, but he would encourage the Planning Commission to strike this as a Permitted Use.

**Steve Erickson, WEAN**

Stated their written comments suggested ways the proposed amendments could be improved, but feels the ultimate solution is to not allow this in the rural part of the County. Some of the current storage facilities are not at full capacity.

He asked about the condition that it not be for business use and the meaning of it.

Mr. Tate clarified that businesses could store items, but would not be allowed to operate a business out of one of these units.

**Chuck Sapp**, 1095 Bridle Trail Lane

Stated a large development in his area was denied, but now a smaller version has been approved after a small two inch ad appeared in the paper. The Growth Management Act states that you are to maintain the property near home development for future home developments.

He stated that in his case the two yellow signs were on the property, but went un-noticed due to the previous application. The notice in the paper he felt had the wrong address and contributed to people in the neighborhood being unaware of where this proposal was located.

He appealed this through the Hearing Examiner and was allowed to show a video that showed a self storage unit that contained all kinds of weapons. There was another case that had 3 people living in the storage unit. It has been proven that it invites more crime. He also stated he felt it was a fire hazard and that bathrooms should be required.

He thought the Hearing Examiner's Office should be separate and completely independent from the Planning Department. He did however want to congratulate the Planning Department, who he felt had done a good job of covering all the issues regarding mini storage facilities.

Mr. Sapp further asked if there was a way the facility in his neighborhood could be disapproved.

**Robert Leach**, 27188 SR 20

Stated the mini-storage facilities should not be allowed in a residential area and should be allowed only in a commercial area. Regardless of how it is disguised it is a commercial facility.

**GayLynn Beighton**, 2507 West Beach Rd.

Stated she agreed this is a commercial use and location of these facilities within the urban areas should be exhausted before being allowed in the rural areas to keep growth focused in the urban areas and protect the natural resources.

Chair Gabelein closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

### **Amendments to Housing Element**

Hand-outs:

Transmittal and Report Memorandum

Current version of the Housing Element.

Housing Element, Planning Commission Draft, May 1, 2009

Anthony Boscolo provided an overview and background. The current Housing Element was adopted in 1998; changes were made to this Element last year, addressing implementation strategies to deal with the widening gap between the average income in the county and the

average housing costs. The average income is growing at a 2% rate while the cost of housing is rising at a 5% rate and as the years progress the gap increases.

More work was needed on the Housing Element to support the implementation strategies; revisions were needed to the Plan itself to update statistics. Through the Affordable Housing Summit last summer all those who participated were invited to take part in this process.

The Goals and Policies Section of the Plan are the same. The Implementation Strategies were updated last year and has a few minor changes, restructuring to be easier for future changes to occur for the implementation itself. They are broken up into regulatory considerations and a programmatic section on maintaining existing housing stock and new development.

Mr. Tate stated the terms and definitions have been better defined in the proposed document, such as what low income is and what affordable housing means. Terms used by Housing and Urban Development are utilized to define low income, very low income and lower income. It better describes what poverty is and some of the accepting definitions and terms used by State and Federal Government were included.

The Housing Element is housing for all, but when it gets down to the implementation strategies it is how the families that are struggling have options and a stock available. Last year when the strategies were looked at by the Planning Commission, frustration emerged indicating some of the strategies lacked context to better help describe their purpose and what they would do.

Regulatory considerations were grouped to identify what kinds of things can be done or considered to encourage affordable housing. There are regulations related to:

- ◆ Guest houses and accessory dwelling units
- ◆ Density bonuses, already provided but now being looked at to see if there is a way of providing affordable housing incentive
- ◆ Ways to better utilize or focus affordable housing development into areas where there more service and infrastructure available.
- ◆ Using transferable Development Rights
- ◆ To be looking at mixed use Rural Areas of Intensive Development, where transit services and public services are close by.

New Development:

- ◆ What incentives or ideas could be incorporated into new proposals using existing codes to better service the creation of more affordable housing through reduced permit fees or the permit review timeline and process?

Maintaining Existing Housing Stock:

- ◆ Existing inventory, looking at taxation and whether rehabilitation of existing homes could be used.

Relationships with Other Agencies:

- ◆ Address the need to partner with other agencies or groups who are addressing this issue.

Programmatic Strategies:

- ♦ How does staff support and promote all of these issues.
- ♦ How to become proactive and come up with the next steps

Commissioner Lippens stated a problem he has seen with affordable housing in the past is the issue of maintaining affordability. At some point those houses become unaffordable.

Mr. Tate stated some communities have housing stock that remains affordable in perpetuity through title. It is limited to a small increase of resale value. Sometimes it is for a limited time, sometimes the land remains with an agency. There are housing authorities and non profits that have answered that question in different ways by adding restriction on title of property.

Chairman Gabelein stated he felt the answer involves the Island County Housing Authority and what this body might do to help them get there.

Chair Gabelein opened the floor to public comment.

**GayLynn Beighton**, 2507 West Beach Rd.

She said she is a commercial Real Estate Broker and serves on the Chiles Associate Team that serves affordable housing in Seattle. She said she would like to submit documents to the Planning Commission. These are documents she submitted in 2008 and would like to re-submit them.

1. The Affordable Housing Index
2. Excerpt from a book on creating more public transit capacity
3. Chart from the Office of Financial Management showing density overall in Island County
4. Article by Theo Eicher regarding a study purporting to show that Growth Management added an extra \$200,000 to the price of the average Seattle home.
5. An article from the Cascadia Weekly titled "Between Quality of Life and Population Density".

She stated the topic was difficult and complex.

1. When you define affordable housing who you are trying to help must be clarified.
2. When defining housing you must consider the hard and soft costs. The initial costs of the structure and the infrastructure. The costs of the ongoing maintenance of the structure and the infrastructure. Most importantly the cost on the environment.
3. When defining affordable housing the cost of transportation is linked to the cost of housing. Hidden costs must be considered.

**Steve Erickson, WEAN**

Stated when dealing with density bonuses as an incentive, those situations where density bonuses are already granted should require that affordable housing be included.

Annexation agreements between Island County and the two cities and town that mandate some or all annexations to provide provisions for a defined amount of affordable housing could be extended by bringing back the TDR program; using it for the transfer of development rights from the rural areas to the UGA's.

Mandating that affordable housing stay affordable; if the County is giving incentives there needs to be some assurance that it will remain affordable; establishing a rotating stock that remains affordable.

Mr. Tate stated that item 1.b. Density Bonuses, addresses that principal.

**Marian Edain, WEAN**

Stated Saratoga Housing is moving in the right direction. She asked if there was a way to grant density bonuses and create an instrument like a conservation easement that is on the ground. The unit may be sold, but the ground cannot. She would like to explore maintaining a public interest in the land.

Chair Gabelein stated the lending institutions would need to get on board as well.

Mr. Tate stated it was a good strategy to put into place, but it won't be defined in this Housing Element. There are going to be regulatory requirements that need to be advanced to the Planning Commission to put that into effect.

**Al Williams, 1875 Fort Nugent Rd.**

First he would like to make a few complements, stating he was impressed with the comprehensiveness of the explanations. He stated this was a very complex and sensitive issue that affects the lives of so many people.

He hopes the Planning Commission would have a good appreciation of those who have been here for many years and then had their lives disrupted by development. Stating it was important to be sensitive to the feelings of the people, many of whom are common people, working people trying to get by.

He said he has noticed deceptive practices by some trying to defeat and get around the Growth Management Act. Oak Harbor amended their land use ordinances in order to tear down a mobile home park and replace with a commercial development, disrupting the lives of all the residents. Now they want to expand low income housing into their Urban Growth Area. He stated he felt this was incongruous because they have squandered a low income affordable housing area and are now using it as an excuse to expand the UGA. To him this is a deceptive practice in order to find an excuse to find and defeat the Growth Management Act. He further stated he would like the Planning Commission to be aware of these things and find a balance. He hopes small people and common people are not trampled upon as this goes forward.

Chair Gabelein closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

**Island County Parks Plan Update**

Hand-outs:

Transmittal and Report Memorandum

Map of County parks on Camano and Whidbey Island

Proposed Amendments to Parks and Recreation Element, Draft May 1, 2009

Brandon Sweeza provided background: The Parks Plan was adopted in 1998; it did not have any specific guidance, only some overarching policies and goals.

Summary of the Update:

- ◆ Updated inventory and descriptions of parks and open spaces within the County.
- ◆ Classified County Parks using Washington State Parks Land Classification System.

Goals and Policies Section: (the most substantial part of the Plan)

- ◆ Provides conceptual guidance for the future management of Island County Parks.

Objective Section:

- ◆ Provides specific objectives developed following analysis of County properties and the proposed Goals and Policies section.
  - Develop Park Specific Plans for each County property
  - Conduct a needs assessment for County parks
  - Expand financial opportunities
  - Establish level of service (LOS) standards
  - Maximize volunteer workforce
  - Develop a plant salvage program
  - Incorporate low impact development (LID) techniques into park planning
  - Utilize park properties to support salmon recovery objectives
  - Develop effective domestic pet management strategies
  - Develop an integrated and consistent standard for park signage
  - Increase accessibility of park properties
  - Increase public awareness of park properties
  - Coordinate park planning with non-motorized transportation goals and strategies
  - Reclassify the zoning designation of all park properties to park zone
  - Seek partnership opportunities with other park agencies
  - Develop education outreach program for local schools
  - Identify all conservation lands not suitable for recreation and develop individual management plans

Summary of Non-County Park & Recreation and Open Space Properties in Island County.

- ◆ Updated to include the other agencies and jurisdictions.
- ◆ Schools ball fields and public facilities were listed.
- ◆ List of Non-Profit Organizations and private owners facilities.

Chair Gabelein opened the floor for public comment

**Steve Erickson, WEAN**

Stated he had provided written comments and wanted to touch on four major areas.

1. Definitions section needs to be added for clarification.
2. A complete inventory of all County owned property is needed, not just the lands under Parks management. The list should include Public Works properties. In terms of parks, recreation and conservation he would like to see lands that are not suitable for recreation

due to a high ecological value or that are highly sensitive have a formal recognition as conservation lands.

3. Toxics policy. Since 2002 the County has not used chemical herbicides for roadside vegetation management, except for listed noxious weeds. He thinks the County Parks are similarly managed and was even prior to 2002. He stated he felt it was time to make that policy more formal in regards to parks.
4. Shoreline public access policy. The County needs to recognize there are numerous public shoreline accesses where the adjacent property owner has taken them over. Restoring public access is not only the right thing to do because it is the public's property it will be far cheaper compared to the cost of buying new shoreline access.

**Marian Edain, WEAN**

She stated that overall she is very pleased this is happening. She then went through some grammatical questions regarding the Plan, stating she will provide a written list.

The inventory of basic services by agency under passive use has nothing listed. In the other charts those are filled in, but not on the overall chart.

**Steve Marx, Director of Island County Parks/ Public Works**

Stated Public Works, who have recently taken over the Parks Department, has been talking to Whidbey Land Trust who has offered money to help support the Parks Plan. Over the next nine to ten months they will help to take a comprehensive review of the Plan to help peak and tweak it to address citizens concerns and generate even more citizen input resulting in a more comprehensive Plan incorporating citizen input.

The Parks Department suffered a 57% cut to the budget. He stated he wasn't sure, but some of the Parks listed may not be part of the County Parks system in the next three to nine months. South Whidbey District has offered to partnership with Public Works and may adopt some of the Parks, but in any case the information that is gathered and recommendations made can be passed on to them. Public Works is also working with the State Parks and Port Authorities.

Mr. Marx ended by saying he had wanted to introduce himself to the Planning Commission and wanted to thank the Planning Department for their hard work.

Commissioner Val Hillers commented that in Chapter 7, page 42 states that Ebey's Landing is owned by State Parks and the Ebey's Landing Trust Board, but the Trust Board is a volunteer agency and wouldn't have any ownership.

Commissioner Ray Gabelein stated the inventory tables would have more if schools and community halls were included. Under community halls there are some that are considered as public, but since they are not private they should probably be included. Progress is being made, but it is not complete. Additional facilities should be included so when looking at this in the future mistakes are not made thinking certain facilities are needed, but were just not included.

**GayLynn Beighton, 2507 West Beach Rd.**

Asked if it would be possible to add and identify habitats of local importance so they can be properly protected. She also want to know if it would be possible to identify properties purchased

with Conservation Futures Funds in order to qualify for a new program whereby Non-Profit groups can apply for maintenance and operations funds to maintain properties purchased with Conservation Futures Funds. It is a way of engaging the public in helping maintain County properties and with these economic times is probably the way of the future.

Commissioner Yonkman stated that in the 2008 docket signage showing where the Parks are was an issue. He asked if anything further had been done in that direction.

Mr. Tate stated on page 35 there is a strategy for increasing public awareness and that possibly another item of signage should be added.

Chair Gabelein closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

*Commissioner Val Hillers moved to have the close of public comment on these items be June 19<sup>th</sup>, Commissioner Reynolds seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

*Commissioner Mike Joselyn moved to adjourn, Commission Val Hillers seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

*Meeting adjourned at 11:38 a.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Bradshaw  
Administrative Assistant