

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE
MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 21, 2004**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by County Commissioner Glen Huntingford at 10:00 a.m. in the first floor conference room of the Jefferson County Courthouse.

ROLL CALL

Committee members present:

Jefferson County: Commissioners Glen Huntingford, Dan Titterness, and Pat Rodgers.

City of Port Townsend: Council members Michelle Sandoval, Freida Fenn, and Laurie Medlicott substituting for Frank Benskin.

Port of Port Townsend: Commissioner Bob Sokol.

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

Guests: Tom McNerney, County Planning Commission; Phil Johnson; and Nancy Dorgan.

COUNTY-WIDE PLANNING POLICIES (CWPPs)

The agenda topic related to potential updates of the CWPP for 2005. Al Scalf began the discussion by providing an overview of the policies and raised areas staff thought may need to be updated. The CWPP were statutorily mandated by the state under 36.70A.210. The current CWPP were adopted in 1992. Since then, both the City and County have adopted their respective Comprehensive Plans. Also, the GMA has been amended, particularly relating to rural provisions and best available science. The Legislature also enacted amendments relating to regulatory reform (36.70B) and the Land Use and Petition Act (36.70C). Additionally, there was case law from the courts and rulings from the Hearings Boards. Mr. Scalf noted that the Port was added in 1999 because the coordination and consistency of the respective comprehensive plans affected a number of elements for the Port as well. He stated that the CWPP were the framework to guide the development of the comprehensive plans. He stated that shoreline issues became a "fourteenth goal" of the GMA through Hearings Board action, adding to the thirteen original goals established by statute.

Al Scalf pointed out some outdated references in the CWPP. They included references to interim ordinances, including interim resource lands ordinances. He stated that best available science was now required for critical areas. Population was another issue. The recent designation of Port Hadlock/Irondale as a UGA and the references to Port Ludlow were also outdated and should be updated. Some issues called for in the CWPP were accomplished through the County's Comp Plan. There were references to community plans. Mr. Scalf pointed out that the Brinnon Plan was the only new community plan to be adopted, although there were other older plans for Gardiner and the Tri Area. Mr. Scalf stated that one question he had was

whether we needed community plans, stating that they added complications to our codes.

Al Scalf stated that there were new issues that possibly should be considered for inclusion in the CWPP. One was the dissolved oxygen issue in Hood Canal. The CWPP talked about water quality, but he suggested that it may be appropriate to address water quantity as well and conservation policies and standards. There were now two UGAs, so the CWPP should be modified to reflect that. There was discussion in the CWPP about inter-local agreements between those UGAs and the County and whether there could be joint review. Now there were Major Industrial Developments [MIDs] and Industrial Land Banks [ILBs] under the statute, which necessitated the removal of language in the CWPP about regional shopping centers or a large industrial complex in the County, because we wanted to utilize the aspects of the Act that provided for those potentials. Another issue the GMSC may want to discuss was the section of the GMA [36.70A.350] which addressed fully contained communities. He stated that the Essential Public Facilities section needed to be updated. Transportation required ongoing updating. Affordable housing continued to be a major concern in our county. There was now a Task Force addressing the issue and there was recent data that could be integrated into the CWPP on the topic. Economic development, although not a mandatory element of the GMA, was a very important aspect for our community. He thought the CWPP on the rural areas should be totally rewritten to conform to the new aspects of the GMA. Policy #10 addressed the GMSC as the body for regional oversight. The question for an update was whether there should be participation from the new UGA and/or from the Port Ludlow MPR.

Al Scalf described possible scenarios for updating the CWPP, including the possibility of forming a subcommittee of the GMSC to work with staff on drafting a recommendation for the full GMSC. He pointed out that adoption of the CWPP was a legislative action of the BOCC. The GMSC would essentially make a recommendation to the legislative authority (the BOCC) for amendments to the CWPP.

Freida Fenn asked about a timeline from staff's perspective for an update of the CWPP. Al Scalf thought it would take most of 2005, working with the respective staffs and the GMSC to formulate a recommendation to the BOCC, and then the BOCC holding a public hearing before adoption of the amendments.

Glen Huntingford asked how a list of potential amendments would be compiled. Al Scalf responded that he saw it coming individually from the City, County, or Port with suggestions for proposals, line-in/line-out. Or, the GMSC may want to form a subcommittee to work with the staffs to prepare a proposal. Mr. Huntingford thought it would be interesting to try having each jurisdiction make line-in/line-out proposals. He commented that the three jurisdictions may be closer than one might think. Once we got that together, the GMSC could work out the differences. Mr. Scalf suggested that the GMSC set a meeting for January and provide direction to staff about how the Committee wanted staff to proceed.

Bob Sokol commented that Mr. Scalf had already taken a "first cut" at a review of the CWPP based upon his presentation. He suggested that Mr. Scalf provide his notes to the Committee as a starting point. Mr. Sokol stated that it was important to note that the last CWPP contained the procedure for amending them.

Glen Huntingford stated that the Committee would discuss the issue before the end of the meeting and set the agenda for the next meeting, which should take place after the first of the year.

**POTENTIAL GMSC REPRESENTATION for the IRONDALE & HADLOCK UGA
and/or PORT LUDLOW MPR**

Glen Huntingford stated that this discussion went back several years to around 1999. It involved both Port Ludlow and representation from a new UGA, when one was formed. Concerning Port Ludlow, he wondered how the Committee would solicit a representative. One way would be to ask for a list of people from the Port Ludlow area from the Village Council. Then the GMSC could interview them. He thought it would take an amendment to the CWPP to set up a procedure. He wondered whether 2005 was the appropriate time to do that, along with the other CWPP amendments.

Glen Huntingford stated the opinion that there should be representation from those communities. His question was how to go about doing that. He asked for the other Committee members' thoughts.

Michelle Sandoval agreed that there should be representation. She had a concern about how to pick someone from Port Ludlow to represent the entire MPR given the differences between the communities within the MPR. She suggested that it may be best to have them decide amongst themselves about who should best represent them.

Pat Rodgers agreed that Port Ludlow had differences between communities. However, Port Ludlow had a Village Council, which was elected. He thought the means to getting a representative on the GMSC would be to ask the Village Council to appoint someone, adding that it might even be their chair. Mr. Rodgers stated that the UGA would be a different matter because that area did not have a governing body other than the County.

Frieda Fenn agreed with Mr. Rodgers about both Port Ludlow and the UGA. She thought that, since the UGA did not have an elected body, it would be difficult to have an appointee that the community felt was representing them. Ms. Fenn stated that all of the current GMSC members were elected officials. She thought it would take some negotiating with the community to see who should represent them.

Bob Sokol agreed that Port Ludlow would be easy because they did have an elected body. The fact that they had a divergence of opinion among their communities could be equated to Port Townsend or other communities as well. He thought that a lot of the controversy in Port Ludlow seemed to be the Village Council versus PLA. He noted that the Village Council was elected by geographical area. His suggestion to the GMSC was that the Port Ludlow representative be selected by the Village Council. He agreed that made the UGA issue a bit more difficult, however. He wondered whether there should be some sort of advisory council representing the UGA, possibly similar to the Port Ludlow Village Council. That would put the UGA's representation on the GMSC out into the future until a council could be established. Another question was whether the Irondale/Hadlock UGA should have the same number of representatives as the Port Townsend UGA.

Dan Titterness asked whether the GMSC would support the County beginning the formation of an advisory body in the Irondale/Hadlock UGA. He thought the County could form it in the same way as any other advisory body, by

soliciting applications. Bob Sokol commented that it would be easy if the UGA was equal to one or two precincts so that there could be an election.

Pat Rodgers commented that an interim answer may be for the GMSC to solicit applications and to interview and select from those applications. It was another approach he was just suggesting.

Michelle Sandoval asked if the BOCC had considered forming some sort of long-term advisory body for the UGA. Dan Titterness replied that the BOCC had considered the concept. It was being raised to the Committee because of the issue about representation on the GMSC. He stated that the BOCC had not made any decisions but they were soliciting input.

Bob Sokol stated that Skagit County had an unincorporated UGA and there were probably others. Glen Huntingford wondered whether there was representation on that county's Steering Committee. He thought the topic should be researched.

Michelle Sandoval stated that, if there was no precedent we could learn from, we should consider some way to district the UGA and hold elections, rather than merely appointing someone. Freida Fenn reiterated that all of the Committee members were elected and the Village Council members were elected. She thought that residents of the UGA would want to feel there was a process of self-determination over time to send representatives themselves. She thought that whatever direction the County took, it should eventually lead in the direction of elected representation. That would parallel everyone else sitting on the GMSC and would honor the democratic rights of that area to participate at that level, similar to every other entity at the table.

The GMSC discussed how the Port Ludlow Village Council was formed and whether that model could be used for the Irondale/Hadlock UGA. They also discussed funding for such a body. Glen Huntingford commented that Port Ludlow was discussing incorporation. With that would come some GMA issues Port Ludlow did not necessarily want to address (affordable housing and industrial and commercial growth to support the community). He thought that having a Port Ludlow representative on the GMSC to address some of those issues was a good idea. Pat Rodgers stated that Port Ludlow as not that many years from buildout by the developer at which time the community's relationship with the developer would be complete. He stated that part of the reason the Village Council existed was the relationship between the community and the developer. He thought it would be a natural evolution for the new relationship to be between the community and the County and the City, etc. He thought it would become closer to a municipality than it was currently, although Port Ludlow would not become a real municipality unless it chose to do so.

Dan Titterness asked if there would be support from the Committee for the BOCC to write to the Village Council asking them to appoint a representative to the GMSC. Glen Huntingford stated that his preference would be to wait and try to address the CWPP issues as a whole before making invitation to join the GMSC. Freida Fenn stated that a process to include Irondale/Hadlock UGA representation should be worked out before inviting Port Ludlow to join the GMSC. She thought the UGA folks may be upset if Port Ludlow was invited onto the Committee and the Committee had not figured out how to accommodate UGA representation yet. Mr. Huntingford agreed that the structure should be in place first. In the meantime, we could answer their questions, if they had questions.

Michelle Sandoval commented that there was a big difference between sitting on the GMSC and being in charge of a homeowners association. While there were people who would get involved no matter where they lived, there were others who would have nothing to do with the association per se. She stated that she heard the same thing from certain people, which was that they did not want to be involved in that. It was another layer of complication of their retired life and was not something they found positive. In some ways she would have a concern that people who would sit on the GMSC would have a broader interest than merely being on a homeowners association.

Glen Huntingford suggested that the Committee talk about the issue again in January. He suggested that the GMSC may want a structure such that when certain things happened in that community, they would have the ability to choose a representative. Then they would have a spot on the GMSC. One option would be for them to be non-voting members. Another option would be to assure that the County Planning Commission had members from those communities and then the Planning Commissioner could be the GMSC representative.

It was agreed that the issue would be discussed again in January.

UPDATE on COUNTY and CITY PROGRESS on 2004 UPDATES to COMPREHENSIVE PLANS and DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

Eric Toews provided an overview of the City's process for updating its Comp Plan and development regulations. He reported that the City conducted its review and assessment as part of establishing the docket for formal review. That assessment and docketing process was done in April, 2004. A total of ten legislative items were docketed and one site-specific rezone. There were four Comp Plan amendments docketed which were mostly technical in nature. One significant item was updating the Plan language relating to the population forecast and allocation. Another related to policy language concerning group homes to assure the Plan was consistent with state and federal statutory mandates. He stated that there were a number of code amendments docketed. The most significant related to adoption of a Transportation Concurrency Management Ordinance, a new off-street parking and loading ordinance, and implementation of best available science.

Eric Toews stated that the City was also working on its Shoreline Master Program [SMP] update. He stated that much of the science being developed in the shoreline jurisdiction was also applicable in the upland areas. Therefore, the City was trying to dovetail as much as possible and not duplicate effort between its Comp Plan and SMP.

Eric Toews explained that the City segregated the topics into amendment packages with the first being technical amendments. That package had already gone through Planning Commission review and recommendation. The City Council had held the first reading of an ordinance for the technical amendments. He stated that staff was currently working on the final draft language for the off-street parking and loading code modifications. That package would go to the Planning Commission in October. It was expected that the Planning Commission would have a recommendation ready to go to the City Council by year's end with City Council hearings in January and February, 2005. The critical areas ordinance, because of the need to dovetail with the Shoreline Master Program update and the need to incorporate the recommendation of a peer review group and public concerns, would go to the Planning Commission in November for their review. The Planning Commission recommendation was

anticipated in January, 2005, and City Council hearings in February and March, 2005. He stated that it was expected that final action on all of the packages would occur before the end of the first quarter of 2005, which was a bit behind the statutory deadline of December 1, 2004. He thought that staff and the policy advisors and decision makers felt it was an appropriate timeframe necessary to factor in public concerns and do a good job, particularly on best available science.

Glen Huntingford asked if the City received grant funding from the state for the update. Michelle Sandoval replied that they did. Jeff Randall stated that the City could possibly receive up to \$192,000, although that was for both the update and the SMP. Josh Peters stated the belief that the County received more money than the City for the update, noting that the County SMP was not due for update until 2011. Mr. Randall stated that the significant difference was because the City was required to update its SMP by the end of 2005.

Josh Peters provided an overview of the County's process for updating its Comp Plan and Unified Development Code [UDC]. He handed out a legal notice which would appear in the September 22 newspaper announcing the hearings, etc. for the County's amendments. He stated that the County would also not meet the December 1 statutory deadline, but only by about two weeks under the current schedule. He noted that under the County's UDC, the BOCC was required to make a final decision by its second meeting in December.

Josh Peters stated that the update was packaged as MLA04-28 and was in two parts. Part A contained the statutorily required update amendments. Part B contained the discretionary amendment proposals resulting from the Planning Commission's 5-year assessment of the Plan. He stated that he would address the next agenda item [Update on discretionary County Comprehensive Plan and UDC amendment proposals] as part of his presentation.

Josh Peters stated that staff and consultants developed the statutorily required update amendments [Part A] in MLA04-28. He stated that the final drafts would be available to the public on September 22, although pre-release drafts of the Transportation, Capital Facilities, and population elements had been available for awhile. He stated that the material available on September 22 would include the proposals themselves as well as the staff report and analysis of them.

Josh Peters stated that Part B of MLA04-28 contained the Planning Commission proposals based on their 5-year assessment of the Comp Plan. A Planning Commission committee conducted the review and made a recommendation to the full Planning Commission, which accepted the proposals with some revisions. That proposal was released to the public on September 1 in order to provide the public with additional review time. The proposal would be formally released on September 22. The Planning Commission proposal basically addressed all the other sections of the Comp Plan not addressed in Part A.

Josh Peters stated that the County had a web site devoted to the 2004 Comp Plan amendment process.

Josh Peters listed the Comp Plan elements for which the Planning Commission had developed line-in/line-out recommendations for amendments (Introduction and Implementation and Monitoring; Land Use and Rural; Housing; Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation; Economic Development; and

Environment). He stated that there was also one site specific redesignation for a parcel at the SR 19/20 intersection.

Josh Peters stated that the amendment proposals would go to the Planning Commission for formal hearings, review and recommendation to the BOCC. The Planning Commission hearing was scheduled for October 6 with the written comment period open until October 13.

Michelle Sandoval asked about the criteria used for the proposed amendments. Josh Peters explained that the criteria came from the UDC. In addition, the Planning Commission developed criteria in response to a BOCC request to remove verbosity from the Plan. He explained the difference between the County 5-year assessment and the state mandated 7-year update. He stated that the County would change the County 5-year assessment to correspond to the statutory 7-year update for future updates. Mr. Peters clarified that the criteria used were a combination of the UDC criteria, the BOCC's direction, and the Planning Commission's own will.

Josh Peters provided information on the other proposed amendments on the docket. Two related to the airport goals and policies and were carried over from 2003 (MLA03-232 and MLA03-244). Another docketed amendment was for potential redesignation of 253 parcels to Agriculture Lands. He explained that a Planning Commission committee had reviewed the subject parcels and made a recommendation to the full Planning Commission. He noted that some parcels were not recommended for redesignation, although most were.

Glen Huntingford asked if the Planning Commission had attempted to bring the two airport groups together (the Port and People for a Rural Quimper) to try to resolve some of the issues. Josh Peters replied that the answer was "Yes" and "No". He stated that the two groups had not met directly. He stated that one meeting of the Planning Commission Airport Committee had representation from both groups in attendance. He stated that the most work had been done by County and Port staff to fulfill a settlement agreement, which was a result of a petition to the Hearings Board by the Port after the County adopted its UDC. He stated that staff had been in communication with both parties. He offered the opinion that the proposal to be released on September 22 fairly met all the original objectives in a way that staff hoped PRQ would be satisfied with. He thought it was fair to say that the Port had shifted its position vis a vis the proposal to such a degree to try to accommodate the PRQ concerns.

Larry Crockett stated that County staff had kind of acted as the mediator for two originally divergent proposals. He thought staff had done a yeoman's job. He stated that everyone should recognize that there was a state law that the County must obey with regard to the airport specifically. He thought the Port had compromised in regard to PRQ's and other citizens concerns. He thought most of the concerned citizens were now satisfied.

Freida Fenn asked about the general industrial area not related to aviation uses that had been proposed by the Port originally. Bob Sokol stated that issue was totally off the table. Josh Peters clarified that the February 1 proposal from the Port contained goals and policies about future industrial uses at the airport. That was still in that proposal. However, in terms of the actual proposal and the uses at the airport itself that would be considered industrial, there were some uses that were already there or were aviation related in some way. He stated that staff was able to reach a resolution on that issue. He stated that some uses that were proposed on

February 1 would be addressed in a future planning process. Mr. Peters encouraged the members to look at the proposal when it came out on September 22. He described the contents of the proposal.

Eric Toews clarified that what was in the proposal would allow a future planning process to examine the range and scale of industrial uses permitted at the airport Essential Public Facility and to allow the Port to come forward with a proposal that would be docketed. He stated that there was also very clear policy language that whatever future action was taken must be consistent with the goals and substance of the planning requirements of the statute. He stated that the discussion was really for another day. What was in the proposal was really just a placeholder to allow that process to occur in the future.

Michelle Sandoval asked for clarification about the placeholder provisions in the proposal, asking if it was something that was agreed to by the elected officials. Josh Peters replied that what was in the proposal represented an agreement between County and Port staff about what staff was proposing as a compromise package for the airport. He did not know about any communication between the BOCC and the Port Commissioners. He stated that the ultimate decision about adoption of goals, policies, and regulations lay with the BOCC. Ms. Sandoval clarified that the proposal was not something that was brought forward in agreement between the policy makers then. It was pointed out that there was a settlement agreement between the County and Port and that future planning (the placeholder) was part of that agreement. Mr. Peters pointed out that the Port Commissioners and BOCC did agree on the settlement agreement. That set in motion the process by which the staff would prepare exact language to implement that settlement agreement. To that degree, they were in agreement. It remained to be seen whether they would agree to the proposed language.

Bob Sokol stated that this issue came as the result of an appeal by the Port to the Hearings Board. The Port and County asked the Hearings Board for the opportunity to work out their differences. That process had been going on for over two years. He stated that this proposal was the result of the respective staffs working together. He stated that Port staff had kept the Port Commissioners informed all through the process, so the Port Commissioners knew about it and were supportive of it. He stated that it could not just be negotiated between the electeds; it had to go through the public process. That was where it was in the process now. He stated that part of the proposal was to make the public aware about the airport, which was one of the big criticisms that started this whole thing off.

Freida Fenn commented that this issue was a good example of something that should have been discussed by the GMSC. Under the CWPP, part of what the GMSC was supposed to do was look at the economic impacts of land use developments and changes that were proposed in the county-wide area. She thought the new UGA issue was also something that would have been appropriate for consideration by the GMSC. Since growth and development was supposed to happen inside the UGAs and since Port Townsend was the only other UGA, she was concerned from a compliance standpoint. For the health of a new UGA and the health of an existing UGA, the GMA concept was that the jobs were supposed to be where the people lived. She stated that these two issues should have been discussed at the GMSC level because there were domino effects.

Dan Titterness stated that the proposal only proposed a future planning process. That was where it could occur. Frieda Fenn responded that she would read the actual proposal when it came out.

Al Scalf stated that the staff report and recommendation to be published on September 22 as it related to best available science would contain recommendations for additional environmental protections in the areas of channel migration zones and shoreline development, specifically setbacks and the functions of the near shore buffer. He stated that the package would also include a white paper on the issue prepared by Dave Christensen.

Glen Huntingford stated that the issues of notice to title and an airport overlay, which had so disturbed people a couple of years ago, still concerned people. However, even after two years, people still said that it was an appropriate use of the adjoining property to have some type of light industrial development, or such use, to utilize that property. He knew that "flew in the face" of what we try to do with the UGAs, but he thought a large majority of the people living around the airport thought it would be a good use there. He was not sure we could do it under the GMA.

DISCUSSION of INDUSTRIAL LAND BANKS and MAJOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Josh Peters stated that RCW 36.70A.365 allowed counties to establish a process by which applicants could approach counties for development of a major industrial development [MID]. He stated that we had not received an application for a MID. RCW 36.70A.367 addressed establishing an industrial land bank [ILB], essentially zoning an area on the land use map for urban style industrial development (a MID). That was something Jefferson County had to take advantage of by the end of 2007 or lose the opportunity. We would be allowed to develop two such areas.

Michelle Sandoval asked about the 2007 date. Josh Peters replied that when the section was originally put into place, there was a sunset date included by which the counties must establish the land banks.

Michelle Sandoval asked if a county could simply zone the area on the land use map or if the infrastructure actually had to be provided by 2007. Josh Peters replied that the original statute said that you had to "provide" infrastructure. Then it was amended to suggest that the county must plan for infrastructure. It would be like planning for a UGA. We would have to do the planning to do the zone and plan for the infrastructure in order to put it on the map by 2007. We did not have to put the infrastructure in. For clarification, an ILB would be a type of a UGA.

Michelle Sandoval stated that she thought the CWPP called for such planning to be done jointly through the GMSC as a cooperative effort, siting a specific reference to Essential Public Facilities [EPFs]. She stated that both the City and County had done such planning independently in the past. Glen Huntingford wondered whether it meant a cooperative effort or whether it meant an effort of courtesy to make sure everyone was aware. He asked if the City Comp Plan currently contained criteria for siting and dealing with EPFs. Eric Toews replied that the CWPP indicated that the County and incorporated UGAs would jointly develop specific siting criteria. Then it went on to list elements of those siting criteria. They were adopted as policy in the Comp Plans of both the County and City. In essence, at least the framework for the siting criteria was in the plan of each jurisdiction. In 1997, the City adopted its zoning code to implement its plan, which included the siting of

EPFs as either a conditional or permitted use in certain zones in the City. It did not include any specific regulatory process for permitting such uses. In 2000, the County adopted its UDC and did the same thing in its use table and adopted a special use permit process that governed such EPFs. It built on the siting criteria of CWPP #4. Mr. Toews stated that the City's assessment of its plan in early 2004 concluded that, while their code did not preclude EPFs, but allowed them, it did not contain any specific regulatory provisions to implement the policy language. Therefore, the City proposed a new draft chapter to implement the siting of EPFs during this cycle. He stated that, in summary, both jurisdictions had somewhat analogous processes that built on the framework of the criteria contained in the CWPP. However, the two jurisdictions never collaborated to further "flesh out" the criteria before doing the respective implementing ordinances. He did not know if that was a huge issue, stating that both jurisdictions met the statutory requirement to not preclude any EPFs. The City would have, after this amendment cycle, a process for reviewing and siting EPFs consistent with the criteria of CWPP #4.

Bob Sokol asked if there had been any EPFs sited in the City or County since the adoption of the respective Comp Plans. There were none. Dan Titterness stated that the Transit Board was actually talking about siting an EPF for their facilities. He suggested that it may be appropriate to revisit the CWPP to further develop the siting criteria. Mr. Sokol pointed out that the issue was siting of an EPF and not uses at an already established EPF.

Michelle Sandoval stated that her point was that, if the jurisdictions were supposed to be jointly doing this, the GMSC possibly could have had some conversation that may have reflected upon the proposal that was going forward. She stated that she was just trying to get clarity about whether the proper process was followed.

Glen Huntingford stated that it seemed to him that both jurisdictions had pretty much done what the CWPP called for in putting the criteria together. Both jurisdictions adopted their Comp Plans and development codes. It did not seem that there was any argument that we were not following our criteria in our plans.

Freida Fenn stated that about a year ago the City had brought up to the GMSC that there should be some process for some joint discussions about siting of EPFs. It would be much better to settle on how that process would occur before there was an actual siting proposal before the jurisdictions. She suggested that the issue be put on a future agenda item. Glen Huntingford questioned the point if both jurisdictions had implemented and were following the adopted criteria. Ms. Fenn stated that it would be so that we looked at the impacts of what any entity was considering doing so that they were not being done in an isolated form. Mr. Huntingford asked whether she thought it was more of a courtesy that we talk about these things ahead of time. Ms. Fenn responded that it could result in a somewhat different proposal. Bob Sokol stated that there was always the public process in which any entity or individual could comment on what was going through the public process, which was probably more direct than sitting in the GMSC.

Glen Huntingford summarized that the GMSC would talk about the issue again. Dan Titterness stated the belief that the MID issue was fairly well addressed already. He thought the ILB issue should be discussed and developed further. He stated that Jefferson County had a date by which to act or lose the opportunity.

Glen Huntingford offered some scenarios for types of uses and locations for ILBs. Bob Sokol stated that particular uses would be more appropriate to an MID and that process. He stated that a ILB was an area that had been designated where more than one industrial business could site. Michelle Sandoval stated that there must be criteria and a process for siting an ILB. That should be the first thing to be adopted. Mr. Sokol stated that the statute indicated that the process was the same as that for an MID. Freida Fenn stated that the exception was that there could be multiple businesses sited in an ILB, whereas a MID was for one business.

Larry Crockett stated that, since an ILB would be sited outside of a UGA, the infrastructure did not need to be to a UGA level of service. He stated that a septic system could be appropriate for an ILB because it limited the ability of the ILB to influence the more rural character of adjacent properties. He stated that the statute also said that the land banks, although they did not have to be, should be considered for siting adjacent to, or in the proximity of, existing UGAs. If there were sites near the Tri Area or Port Townsend, they should be looked at first before going out into other areas of the county. Mr. Crockett stated that the Olympia office had told them that other factors included cost. A small business that could not find appropriate land in the UGAs because of cost and just wanted to rent could site in an ILB. That could be a factor for using a land bank area.

Glen Huntingford suggested that the Committee begin considering the ILB issue more closely and get more information so the GMSC could have some discussions over the next few months. He stated that the GMSC could make a recommendation about whether to go forward. He thought it should be seriously considered to see if there were options we wanted to pursue. The Committee members agreed. Mr. Huntingford asked County staff to look into the topic further and schedule it back to the GMSC for discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Glen Huntingford opened the floor to public comments.

Herb Beck asked what this whole process [the Comp Plan updates] would cost the County and where the money would come from. Glen Huntingford replied that we knew it would cost more than the \$80,000 grant money the County had received. He stated that it was something the County had to do, however.

Larry Crockett stated that, concerning the land bank issue, Mary Winters had called DCTED and the actual legislative people who had drafted the statute language to make sure what their intent was. He reported that they were very excited about getting some land banks established in the state. He stated that it would be important to be on the same page as the DCTED staff to really understand it.

Nancy Dorgan stated that she did not like the idea of placeholder amendments at the beginning of the Comp Plan amendment cycle. She stated that she attended the last County Planning Commission meeting. She stated that they added on expansion of a LAMIRD, piggybacking on the 2004 update. She thought a way for the County to save some money was to not allow that kind of thing to happen. She stated that the County had some pretty specific input from the Hearings Board regarding LAMIRD expansion, yet the County was considering something that was not docketed as a site specific rezone at the beginning of

the cycle and that was coming in just a few days before it goes to public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

The GMSC agreed to meet again in January, 2005. Agenda topics could be: (1) further discussion about the CWPP, (2) the respective Comp Plan updates, (3) the Industrial Land Bank issue, and (4) the composition of the GMSC.

Glen Huntingford stated that it would be a good idea for the Port staff to share the information they had on the ILBs with County and City staff.

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