

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE
MINUTES FOR APRIL 19, 2005**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by County Commissioner Phil Johnson at 10:00 a.m. in the Commissioner's chambers of the Jefferson County Courthouse.

ROLL CALL

Committee members present:

Jefferson County: Commissioners Phil Johnson, David Sullivan, and Pat Rodgers.

City of Port Townsend: Council members Michelle Sandoval, Frank Benskin, and Frieda Fenn.

Port of Port Townsend: Commissioner Bob Sokol.

Staff present: Al Scalf and Josh Peters, County Department of Community Development; County Administrator John Fischbach; and County Deputy Prosecutor David Alvarez. Jeff Randall, City Community Development Department. Herb Beck, Port Commissioner; and Larry Crockett, Port Executive Director.

There were about seven members of the public present. Those who signed the guest list were Jim Hagen and Nancy Dorgan.

MEMBERSHIP ON THE GMSC

Josh Peters reported that the county had advertised for people who lived in the UGA or operated a business in the UGA to apply for the three positions. Only two letters of interest had been received to date. Phil Johnson stated that the BOCC had decided to extend the time for applications.

Josh Peters stated that the Committee had discussed how the Port Ludlow Village Council was constituted. Commissioner Rodgers was going to look into that information. Pat Rodgers stated that he had requested the information from the Village Council and had received the information. It had been distributed to the BOCC. However, it apparently had not been distributed to the other members of the GMSC. Mr. Rodgers stated that he would see to it.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNTY-WIDE PLANNING POLICY
AND
INDUSTRIAL LAND BANKS**

Josh Peters stated that the GMSC had discussed the need to update the County-wide Planning Policy [CWPP] at its previous meeting. He reported on the review City and County staff had done, stating that staff had taken a minimalist view of any revisions. He described the process for revising the CWPP.

Josh Peters pointed out two staff notes in the draft CWPP amendments. One was on tiering in Policy #1.5 and the other related to the definition of affordable housing in Policy #6.1.

Jeff Randall thought that most of the proposed amendments were appropriate and would bring the CWPP up to date. Concerning affordable housing, he

thought the City and County needed to be consistent with an appropriate definition. Mr. Randall stated that he had some comments on the proposed amendments but wanted to provide them to the City Council members first. He added that he thought the amendments could be adopted fairly soon, offering the opinion that one more round of review by staff, after discussion with the respective GMSC members, was likely to be all that was necessary.

Pat Rodgers stated that when these CWPP were adopted in 1992, there was only one UGA, the city, and the CWPP were written accordingly. Now there were two UGAs plus the master planned resort [MPR]. He stated that, now, if the City wanted to make policy that affected the other UGA or MPR or the County, it ought to be with consultation. While he understood the difference that was present in 1992, things had changed and there now needed to be two-way communication relative to policies adopted both in the City and the County. He stated that the CWPP now said that the County actions must be in consultation with the City, but he thought it should now be a two-way process. Therefore, he thought the CWPP needed a more extensive review than simply housekeeping.

Bob Sokol stated that it seemed the CWPP included a two-tiered UGA. There was an incorporated UGA and an unincorporated UGA. He stated that there was something in the CWPP that said that the County and the incorporated UGA [the City] would basically determine what happened in the county, including the other UGA. He suggested that something needed to be done to address the issue. Frieda Fenn stated that there was something in state law on the issue. She suggested a copy of the RCW be available for reference. Mr. Sokol stated that the county and the incorporated UGA were given a lot of power while the unincorporated UGA was kind of a stepchild. He thought the unincorporated UGA needed to be brought more into the decision-making. He understood that Port Townsend was incorporated and had its own comp plan and municipal code. He thought the two comp plans (City and County) needed to be consistent with each other.

Pat Rodgers stated that the UGAs had responsibilities. That meant the unincorporated UGA had responsibilities as well as the incorporated UGA. He agreed that the unincorporated UGA did not have some powers. However, relative to the GMA, there were fundamental concepts that an unincorporated UGA needed to carry out in relationship to the City and the County. But the City also needed to do its responsibilities relative to the other two. He thought that was a good reason to have representatives from those areas on the GMSC. He thought there was a new premise and we needed to adjust to that.

David Sullivan stated that the County was the municipal government for the unincorporated UGA, so in that sense there was that avenue. He stated that we had opened the GMSC up to representation from that area and thought we were moving in that direction. He wondered if there were specific language changes Mr. Sokol would suggest. Bob Sokol responded that he was not exactly sure where they were. It was a general feeling as he reviewed the CWPP that something needed to be adjusted. He referred to wording such as "in consultation with" and "with the approval of" as examples. Pat Rodgers offered the opinion that this was just a premise that was suggested and it needed to be reviewed with those eyes. He thought it was too early to suggest specific policy, but he thought we should be thinking in terms of that and amend the draft to include a broader perspective.

Frieda Fenn suggested the committee discuss areas of conversation for the next meeting. As background, the CWPP referenced a "White Paper" that preceded the CWPP. She requested a copy of that "White Paper" for review by the committee members as historical background.

Frieda Fenn asked if there was some interest in looking at the tiering structure for infrastructure (Policy #1.5). Ms. Fenn expressed concerns about Policy #1.9. She questioned whether an ILB was really a de facto UGA under the RCW, acknowledging that the policy was correct that MIDs were. She asked that the issue be reviewed and the policy be consistent with the state law. She thought it was important to understand the differences and distinctions between the two. Bob Sokol asked if Ms. Fenn was suggesting that Policy #1.9 address MIDs only and there be an additional policy [#1.10] addressing the ILB. Ms. Fenn agreed to that possibility, but reiterated that the language should be consistent with the state law. Josh Peters explained that there was more language in the economic development policy that was meant to distinguish between the two. He stated that this policy was intended to distinguish between the types of UGAs. He stated that Policy #1.9 was intended to merely say that those uses [MID and ILB] were urban growth areas, although not intended to accommodate population. Michelle Sandoval stated that she did not see anything in the RCW that provided that an ILB was a UGA. She asked that staff sort that out and point it out to the committee.

Frieda Fenn referred to Policy #2.1 and #2.3 which addressed development standards necessary in UGAs. Her concern was relative to the MIDs and ILB issue and urban level of service under Policy #2. She stated that the law said that a MID or ILB must be self contained, but she questioned whether a "full range of governmental services" would be required. She thought the committee should discuss the relationship between the types of UGAs and the "governmental services" that would be necessary for each. Bob Sokol wondered about the relationship between a UGA and a de facto UGA. He stated that a MID, by definition, would not have a residential component to it; it was not a traditional UGA. He agreed that the issue should be discussed. Ms. Fenn stated that the discussion should include what state law required the governmental entities to provide for each type.

Frieda Fenn referred to Policy #3.3 regarding the incorporated UGAs and the County identifying and protecting open space. She wondered whether the City and County had ever done any joint planning on open space. She wondered whether it could be a possible future committee topic. She pointed out that, again, it raised the issue of just talking about the City and County. Bob Sokol offered the opinion that the whole section needed to be reviewed because things had changed. He pointed out that "incorporated UGAs" was mentioned several times in the policy and thought it should be reconsidered in light of the unincorporated UGA now designated. Ms. Fenn pointed out that the RCWs did not mention unincorporated UGAs; it only talked about incorporated UGAs and the county as the only governmental entities.

Pat Rodgers referred to Policy #7 regarding economic development. He stated that it had come to light that intellectual products and properties were not considered to be industrial or commercial; they were considered to be service. He noted that the policy said "particular attention should be given to these non-service sector businesses". He thought that if there was ever an area that was appropriate to pursue, it was intellectual based type products. He thought that should be changed. Under Policy #7.2, it discussed growth necessary to meet future population and employment

forecasts. He stated that we needed to change the definition of what we meant by industrial if we really intended to pursue intellectual businesses, and zone for them, and provide infrastructure for them.

Freida Fenn asked if CTED had definitions for them. Pat Rodgers replied that the federal government had a list of business codes for tax purposes. David Sullivan stated that we had not had to deal with such businesses because they were now being done in peoples' homes. The hope was that those businesses would grow and need larger facilities. He cited Mobilisa as an example. Michelle Sandoval suggested that such businesses be specified and specifically called out in a definition.

Frieda Fenn referred to Policy #7.6 which addressed the designation of up to two master planned locations as part of an ILB. She thought it would be good to go back to the root of the RCW and further define the process. She thought one of the uses of the CWPP was to figure out how we worked together. She referred to the process used to develop the MID process as an example and thought a similar process should be developed to address the ILB in advance. She suggested that it would be worth the GMSC considering what kind of specific procedure could be developed relative to the ILB issue. She thought we could learn more about the ILB process, noting that a land inventory was a prerequisite to designating a ILB site.

Bob Sokol stated that CTED had learned a lot through the Lewis County process. He stated that we had done the MID process with no deadline, noting that the ILB designation had a deadline of December, 2007. He stated that we could spend a lot of time coming up with MOUs and attending meetings. He stated that if an ILB designation was to be put into the comp plan amendment process, it had to be proposed by February 1, 2007. He was concerned about processing the issue to death rather than moving forward.

David Sullivan reported on his contact with Senator Jim Hargrove's office about the deadline issue. He stated that an attempt to change the deadline had failed in this legislative session, but there had been some indication that it may happen next year. While there was some possibility the date may be extended, it did not mean we should wait. He stated that the County had put forward funding to get the inventory started. Also, staff had a lot of information based on Lewis County for the process to go through. He stated that the real action was to get on with some of the basic work we had to do in terms of getting the land inventory started. He thought it would be fine to work out some of the issues, stating that the RCW provided some guidance for issues to address when deciding how to work together. One of those was revenue sharing. He thought we needed to work on several elements at the same time. He thought we needed to work at the state level on the deadline issue, not just for our sake but for other jurisdictions that may not be as far along as we were. We also needed to get started on the land inventory. He thought we could also work on some of the other details, stating the opinion that we could work on several tracks at the same time.

Bob Sokol stated that an interesting thing about the land inventory was that all three jurisdictions were represented at the table. He thought it was a poor gamble to bet on an extension. Pat Rodgers stated that the inventory would benefit all of the jurisdictions, the City, Port and County. He thought all three jurisdictions should press for that.

Michelle Sandoval stated the belief that a MOU was an essential piece, with revenue sharing being one part of it. She thought it could be done in a

shorter amount of time than the MID process had taken. She stated that she would like to see the GMSC start working on it and suggested a subcommittee be utilized to work on the details. She thought a primary discussion should be whether or not we needed an ILB. If we decided that we did, then the discussion could turn to the process for accomplishing it.

David Sullivan stated that the main point he had garnered from the CTED workshop was that it cost a lot more to not have a good public process and to not have everyone working together to work out the issues. In the meantime, the issue was making a commitment, as the County had, to fund the required land inventory and getting that project started. Pat Rodgers asked if the City had contributed to the land inventory. John Fischbach replied that the County contribution was intended to match the Port and City, possibly.

Bob Sokol stated that revenue sharing was one thing, but cost sharing was another issue. He thought cost sharing and the cost of the process should be the first thing to consider. He stated that the County had committed to \$25,000 and the Port had been asked to match it. He reported that the EDC had indicated that the cost of the inventory and analysis would be \$100,000. That left a \$50,000 shortfall. David Sullivan stated that there may be a match from CTED. Frank Benskin commented that it seemed fair to share costs if you were going to share revenues. Mr. Sokol stated that the costs of placing infrastructure was another issue to consider, in addition to the planning issue. Frieda Fenn stated that a cost benefit analysis should be a consideration as well.

A question was asked about a scope of work for the land inventory. John Fischbach responded that he had asked the EDC Director [Tamer Kirac] to provide a scope of work. He reported that Mr. Kirac had indicated that there was a consultant from Vancouver who had indicated that \$100,000 would be sufficient for the work. He thought that if each jurisdiction contributed \$25,000, CTED would match the remaining \$25,000 for the \$100,000 total.

Pat Rodgers stated that the inventory would really provide two things. One was the inventory itself. But the inventory would be beneficial to both the City and County through the analysis of whether we had enough land or needed more land. He thought the analysis was really more important than the inventory. It would be a fundamental document that all the jurisdictions could utilize, even if the analysis showed that we did not need a land bank.

Michelle Sandoval stated that she concurred with Mr. Sokol's comments reported in the paper that he had not seen the need for this amount of money. She was not yet convinced of the need to participate in the EDC inventory. She stated that maps were available showing infrastructure and land parcels. It just did not seem to her that it would take that much money to do the study. She remembered another study [Trottier] that had cost a lot of money and which had been very controversial. She thought the process for doing an inventory was very important because if we would have decisions based upon the study, we had to agree on how we would get there.

Pat Rodgers stated that he had been a critic of that earlier study. However, he stated that we were lucky to have Mr. Kirac as the EDC Director because of his experience as an economist. David Sullivan stated that it would not be a one time inventory; it would be an updatable database. We could always have updated information at hand and it could be used as a marketing tool as well. Michelle Sandoval stated that was a whole different thing than merely an inventory of existing lands. It was also a different cost than what we were

supposed to be doing for the land bank inventory. She stated that, once again, a scope of work was necessary because we needed to know what we were buying.

Bob Sokol stated that the current lands were in the GIS system. He stated that he had asked the question about why it cost so much. The answer was that it was all in the analysis. David Sullivan stated that you wanted it to be in a form that you could update it in the future without having as much expense. John Fischbach stated that Mr. Sullivan made a good point, that you wanted it in a searchable database, which was expensive to produce. Such a database would allow prospective businesses to search for available county land using their needs parameters. Pat Rodgers stated that if the analysis was done right, you would have what was called an analytical template. Once you had that, our staff could update the template to get updated results. He stated that the template was the hard part.

Frieda Fenn stated that one of her questions was whether we should have had such information as preparatory documentation for when the County and City designated their commercial/industrial areas. David Alvarez responded that it was a different matter because those areas were based upon the built environment as LAMIRDS.

David Sullivan stated that the point was that if this work had been done during an earlier County planning process, we would have had the information today to use in talking about the need for a land bank or whether it was premature. Michelle Sandoval stated that she thought it should be bulleted items that everyone agreed with, based upon the law, that said "Upon this conclusion, this would happen". Otherwise, we would be in the same argument again. She stated that the Trottier Report, which had been so controversial, had cost a lot of money. She stated that we would go down that same road unless we learned the lesson from Trottier. She thought there was a lot to work out about reaching an agreement on what we were looking for and what those conclusions would then precipitate. Bob Sokol stated that went back to the scope of work.

Frank Benskin stated that a scope of work would be one issue. He thought how the group chose to work together would be a secondary issue.

Phil Johnson asked if the scope of work would be out soon. John Fischbach replied that it should be. Jeff Randall stated that he thought the scope of work was a critical piece and asked for a copy of it when available. Another important piece was a MOU. Mr. Fischbach stated that we also had to be careful not to paralyze the process. He thought the GMSC was currently in the process of paralysis. Freida Fenn disagreed, offering the opinion that the committee was talking about creating an interlocal agreement and creating specific steps about how to work out the issues. She thought the problem was doing that after the fact instead of before we set out to do the work, so that there was a clear understanding. She thought the process used for the MIDs was an excellent one that could be copied. Bob Sokol was concerned that these issues be dealt with concurrently rather than in a linear way. Ms. Fenn thought that could happen. David Sullivan stated that we needed to have agreement that everyone was committed to doing it. That came down to deciding whether it was worth it and committing some money to it along the way, knowing that there were a lot of details to work out. He stated that there needed to be a commitment to move forward. If there was not a commitment to move forward and commit some resources, perhaps we should focus our energies elsewhere. However, he thought we could move forward in a

number of directions at the same time. Michelle Sandoval stated that she would be happy to move forward, but she wanted to see what their money was buying. She thought each jurisdiction should compile a list of its concerns and exchange them with each other.

Frank Benskin suggested that the committee had talked about what we should do. He thought the committee should decide what it would do. Frieda Fenn stated that the City members had just received the draft CWPP. They would need to review them and bring their recommendations to the full City Council, which would be the body to approve any recommendations. She stated that the GMSC members would need to review the inventory scope of work in a similar manner. She pointed out that the City representatives on the GMSC worked differently from the BOCC; they could not make decisions independent of the City Council. The City committee members and their staff discussed when they could meet on the issues. Jeff Randall offered the opinion that we could work on both the CWPP and the ILB issues concurrently.

David Sullivan stated that the issues that may arise, such as revenue sharing, were not things that had not been worked out in other jurisdictions. We could draw on that experience. He agreed that the devil was in the details. Concerning revenue sharing, Bob Sokol stated that one of the things that came out in the workshop was that the proponent bore the responsibility for the costs. He described the costs in Lewis County, with two county FTEs being part of that. He stated that his assumption was that this [the ILB] was a County-driven project. He stated that Tamer Kirac had said the Port was the proponent, which had taken him aback. He stated that we were a long ways away from revenue sharing. Mr. Sullivan stated that the Port was the only entity that had proposed a ILB; there had been no one else come forward as a proponent.

The meeting was interrupted by a fire drill. Upon resumption, Pat Rodgers stated that the assumption was being made that the analysis would be that we needed a land bank and that it should be at the airport, but that may be an erroneous assumption. While he could understand how a proponent would be responsible for a MID, he did not understand how it could apply to a land bank. He stated that a land bank was putting aside property for future use. That may not happen for years. He stated that in reviewing the Lewis County proposal, it had started out being a MID but ended up being a ILB of around 1,000 acres. That was much different from what we were talking about here. He stated that he was having a hard time differentiating between a MID and a ILB, except that a land bank was held for future development. He stated that if we went through the study and found that we needed a land bank and determined a location, it was almost independent of the land owner, perhaps, although he was not sure.

John Fischbach stated that we were talking about two different things. He stated that the costs of a land bank were unknown and were costs that were above and beyond what we were talking about here. Currently, we were talking about doing an inventory and data analysis of the land available in the county. If and when we did a land bank, the inventory would be needed. But we needed the inventory no matter what.

Frieda Fenn stated that the EDC had been hired several years ago to do an inventory. It was supposed to be a searchable database that could be updated. She asked where that work product was. She wondered whether the Multiple Listing Service database would provide many of the functions we were talking about. Tamer Kirac stated that he could not speak to what happened

before. He stated that board members of the EDC should have made sure the work had gotten done. As the current Director, he could find out what happened and how much work had been accomplished. He thought that should be put aside, however, and start looking at today's opportunity. Mr. Kirac stated that he would personally commit his services to get this work done. He stated that he could only describe what he had learned about what the process required for a land bank study. He stated that the EDC had been in touch with Lewis County and CTED about how to expedite the process. The message had been to make sure we did the up-front work, make sure it was open, make sure it was inclusive, make sure everyone involved knew their roles and responsibilities and accountabilities. He stated that the EDC had begun meetings with the County, City and Port on a process. He stated that Lewis County would provide information on their process. He reported that they had been working on a draft scope of work for a potential RFP. They had an Infrastructure Asset Committee of the EDC that was actively involved in the project. They had a meeting on April 29 to review a draft of the RFP. He thought a preliminary draft could be shared within about a week. He stated that the affected jurisdictions needed to be involved in the process and suggested doing a MOU. He thought it was essential for the involved agencies to have a preview of what the task entailed and what the outcomes were. He thought it was a mistake to look at this exercise as simply a databank. We needed relevant, accurate information of all available industrial lands in the county in order to conduct the study. The study needed to have a cost benefit component that the current study did not have. He believed that, because of the sensitivity of this issue in this county, we needed to have buy-in from all affected jurisdictions. The only way to accomplish that was to do a very good study that would provide responses to alternatives to develop opportunities in the county. He believed the Lewis County study was inadequate, stating that it cost \$15,000. Another example study from Snohomish County cost \$150,000. So we were looking at a range of \$15,000 to \$150,000 to do a good study that would provide an opportunity for the decision makers to make a selection from various alternatives, one of which may be an industrial land bank possibly close to the airport. He stated that we would only see the result once the study was done. He stated that we should not "jump the gun". He stated that he expected to have a scope of work available in about two weeks. Then everyone would be able to review it and provide input on whether the scope of work would satisfy the needs of the jurisdictions.

Pat Rodgers asked if an analytical template would be a product of the study so that our staff could use the analysis process after the study was completed. Tamer Kirac responded that there was a process for analysis that would maximize societal returns, not financial, because it would require public funding. Therefore, you were accountable to the public and would need to do an economic impact study/cost benefit analysis that was far more than a straight financial analysis. He stated that other studies done in this county did not include such an analysis. They included only a financial analysis to the agency, not to the public. He thought it was something that was crucial to this study to have multi-jurisdictional buy-in.

Michelle Sandoval offered the personal opinion that she could probably buy into the study more if there was not a presupposition that a land bank would be located at the airport. While she knew that Mr. Kirac had couched it in terms of it being anywhere and "possibly" the airport, she thought it could be anywhere and possibly the Tri Area, or anywhere and possibly the City. Bob Sokol stated that ILBs were outside of UGAs. Ms. Sandoval stated that she understood that, stating that she should have said near the City. She

stated that there was a point where having that constantly in the dialog [the airport] did a disservice to the process itself. She thought if we were going to look at a land bank in a manner that was fair across the board, we could not continue to presuppose an outcome, even in terms of "maybe". She did not think it was fair to the jurisdictions and the public if we were truly going to get all the players at the table.

David Sullivan stated that, at the same time, we would be setting aside particular land. He pointed out that, practically, up until now the Port was the only entity with a large piece of land. Michelle Sandoval responded that she would not presuppose that. She stated that one of the things that would happen was about cost. She acknowledged that the GMA did not allow extension of certain services outside of a UGA. At the same time, in order for the City to fully implement its light industrial area and have full economic value of that industrially zoned area, they needed to have a sewer system that looped around that area. She suggested that it seemed to her to be logical to have a land bank near that light industrial area because it was close to the only heavy industrial area in the county. She thought there may be the ability to have a land bank there with sewer service extended into it. She stated that she had never put that idea on the table because she did not think that was a direction the GMSC should be going in its dialog; we should not be presupposing anything. We should be looking at a map and deciding what made sense.

Bob Sokol stated that a ILB would be located outside of a UGA. Michelle Sandoval stated that the area she was discussing was outside the City but adjacent to the paper mill. Mr. Sokol stated that one of the criteria was that an ILB be located near a UGA. David Sullivan stated that in practical terms, someone owned that property, and it was not one of the governmental entities at this time. He thought that one thing that made this ILB idea do-able was that a governmental entity owned it. Otherwise, the other place could be an MID if the property owner wanted to do it. Ms. Sandoval stated that, as part of the Glen Cove analysis, the area was referred to as an "urban reserve". If it was an urban reserve and a ILB was a de facto UGA, then it fit into place. She stated that one of the things governmental agencies did was zone land. She stated that another question was, if we did not have the financial ability to purchase the land, how we would have the financial ability to put the infrastructure in. Ms. Sandoval stated that her point was that we should not talk about any particular place in order to have a clear, fair process. We should only talk about a process for siting. Mr. Sullivan stated that his point was whether this issue was worthwhile going into because, if no one was interested, we should move on.

Pat Rodgers stated that, again, we were combining two issues. He stated that, first, we really needed to do the study and analysis in order to make the determinations. He agreed with Ms. Sandoval, offering the belief that the answers to the issues would become apparent. He suggested that the committee should just leave it at that. He thought that we would never have gotten to this point if there had been no interest shown in a land bank. But now that we've started down that road, we realized that there was some work that needed to be done first, and that should be done.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Nancy Dorgan stated that we should not make the discussion about the CWPP all about the industrial land bank. She stated that there were some very interesting things in the CWPP that deserved consideration, the notion of

fully contained communities for one. The question was whether we wanted such communities and whether we had water for such communities. She thought it was time for us to start planning for the population projections in relation to how much water we had. She suggested doing something in the low range [of population growth]. She stated that our planning seemed to be evermore on economic opportunity and economic development related zoning. She thought we had lost track of the fact that the GMA gave us a huge choice in terms of how much we had to plan for. She stated that she was not a "no-growther". She stated that within what we were told we had to plan for, we were given a range. She stated that it was certainly within the jurisdictions' purview to plan for the low end of the range. While she knew it was pretty radical, it was practical. Ms. Dorgan stated that part of the difficulty for the Transit Authority board reaching a decision on siting a new base was partly based on the fact that the CWPP were deficient. While the CWPP talked about siting, they did not provide a process for siting. Regarding the land bank, she stated that there were some Hearings Board cases that were due soon that would provide better input. She stated that the County's 2004 GMA update changed language regarding the industrial land bank and the CWPP. She cited one deletion in particular that said "The Tri Area-Glen Cove Special Study will provide the county with information on which to base future decisions on industrial activities. It is anticipated that the Glen Cove area will be returned to the appropriate location where the majority of the county's future industrial development will occur." She questioned why that language was deleted if not in preparation for this ILB discussion. She stated that the 2004 cycle SEPA analysis had to address the question of whether sufficient urban land was designated and zoned to accommodate projected urban growth. The county adopted as part of its environmental review a statement that said "Based on the City of Port Townsend's 2002 annual comprehensive plan assessment dated April 15, 2002," (plus their own analysis), "there appears to be adequate vacant land in all zoning categories to accommodate future anticipated growth." She stated that she raised the issue because she thought there was a gross misunderstanding about ILBs relative to the need. She stated that ILBs had nothing to do with need. She stated that if you needed it, you had to zone land as was required under the GMA. It was required that you zone adequate land for your needs based upon the growth projections. She stated that the MID and ILB were optional development tools if you wanted to do them. You did not do them because you needed to do them; you do them because you want to do them. She stated that the discussion she would like to hear, and had not yet, was a discussion on the huge question on our values of retaining the rural quality of our county, supposing that we have provided adequate zoning as the law required. She stated that the question was, What else do we want to do to our home? Do we want to rip open the guts of the Quimper Peninsula? Do we need to do that? Do we want to do that? It sounded like some people did. She put that larger question before the committee. Ms. Dorgan stated that a more technical question was whether the inventory would be on all available industrial lands. She stated that when we adopted the MID language, it pre-zoned the entire county. She stated that MIDs went on rural lands and became de facto UGAs. She stated that it was not an appealable action to the Hearings Board. It would require a Superior Court suit if the neighboring property owners did not like it. She thought that was a Constitutional taking. Ms. Dorgan questioned what would be studied. If you were going to study where an MID or ILB could go, you would be looking at the whole county because they could go anywhere. That was the problem. She stated that the MID process was already set up, although she did not understand that process.

Jim Hagen stated that when the discussion of preserving rural character came up, he liked to inject that the GMA definition of rural character talked about "foster traditional rural lifestyles", "rural based economies with opportunities to both live and work in rural areas". So the definition of rural character was not just a visual one, but the opportunity to do work there. He addressed the premise of the CWPP amendment process. He referred to the CWPP where it said that the amendments must be agreed to by the City and the County. He stated that by his witness of these meetings, it seemed like the City and County agreeing was a huge stumbling block. While the City and County developed the planning policies, they did not interfere with the City's own land use process. He saw that as saying the City had some autonomy and was not affected by the County's planning policies. He thought that should go both ways. When he saw the words "must agree", he saw it as the City having veto power over county-wide policies that affected County jurisdiction. He thought language like "in consultation with" or "in cooperation with" was fine, but "must agree" was not. He stated that he would like to see language that gave the County more latitude since the City had already built into its existing land use plans and codes more autonomy. He referred to CWPP #7.1 where it said that the private sector was primarily responsible for the creation of economic opportunity in the county. From his standpoint, he was not sure that was correct. He thought the private sector was responsible for economic development. He saw the responsibility of the public sector as providing opportunity. He stated that the "community and environmental values" were very subjective. He thought the processes should contain the means by which some of what was being discussed could be accomplished. He referred to the land bank issue, stating that the RCW was an enabling law. It was something the state was offering the counties. It was saying that it was an avenue for economically distressed communities. He stated that there was discussion about the process or money. However, he thought that it really amounted to the will to do it. He stated that the will to do it would overcome any criteria written in the law. He did not believe that a good law created criteria that was so prohibitive that it could not be achieved. He stated that whether it was the land bank or just the general development of economic opportunity, if there was the will, it could be done. He stated that the pursuance of the land bank issue, which was being manifested through the inventory, showed a will to proceed. If it turned out that a land bank was not the way to go, the will would still be there. He thought one reason the Port property kept coming up was that the Port had stepped forward. He stated that he was pleased to hear discussion of the possibility of a potential second site. This was the first time he had heard someone come forward and say they were interested. He stated that part of this issue was, if you want it, go out and get it.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee discussed its next meeting date. June 14 was set as a tentative date.

Bob Sokol stated that he would send his comments on the CWPP to County staff. He noted that the City would need to do its review work on them as well. He stated that the scope of work for the inventory would likely be sent to everyone individually.

Pat Rodgers stated that he would send out the information on the Port Ludlow Village Council.

Topics for the next meeting would be the CWPP, the land inventory scope of work from the EDC, and draft MOUs.

John Fischbach commented that it sounded like a lot of work if it was not going to go anywhere. He asked if everyone was saying that it would go somewhere if everything looked good. Pat Rodgers stated that the County had already said it wanted to move forward. Michelle Sandoval stated that they could not make that decision for the City; that was a City Council vote. Mr. Fischbach thought it was unfair to staff to put that much work on them if there was not going to be anything come from it. Ms. Sandoval stated that she understood Mr. Fischbach's position, but they had to take it back to their committee and make a recommendation to the full Council. That was the only way they could do it. While they were not paralyzed, they did move slowly. Bob Sokol stated that perhaps Mr. Fischbach's question was whether the City members would take back a positive message to Council. Frieda Fenn stated that she thought she had been clear about her questions and concerns about the CWPP and the ILB issue. Beyond that, she would not make statements until the City Council took a position.

Josh Peters stated that County staff would do some revisions to the CWPP based upon today's discussions. He asked that the City comments, after their review, be forwarded to County staff for incorporation into a draft.

Pat Rodgers stated that if the City Council said "No" [to the ILB issue], he asked that the City members let the County know as soon as possible, so that the County did not "spin its wheels". Also, there was the issue of the County's commitment of the \$25,000.

John Fischbach raised a question about the process for amending the CWPP. There was some discussion with the City representatives about interpretation. It appeared that the City's interpretation was that it was a sequential process including all of the steps cited in Policy #10. Mr. Fischbach asked for the Deputy Prosecutor's opinion. David Alvarez stated that he would provide it later.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Cheryl Halvorson, Secretary