

JEFFERSON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES FOR MARCH 2, 2005

- A. OPENING BUSINESS
- B. PUBLIC HEARING-2005 COMPREHESIVE PLAN AMENDMENT PRELIMINARY DOCKET
- C. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL-INDUSTRIAL LAND BANKS
- D. ADJOURNMENT

A. OPENING BUSINESS

The regular meeting was called to order at the WSU Learning Center at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Allen Panasuk. Planning Commission members present were Phil Flynn, Edel Sokol, Eileen Rogers, Dennis Schultz, Bud Schindler, Jim Hagen, and Linda Swisher.

DCD staff present were Josh Peters, Kevin Russell, and Cheryl Halvorson, secretary.

There were about twenty members of the public present. Those who signed the guest list were Judi Morris, Margaret Matheson, Bob Matheson, Jeanne Straub, Dean Straub, Chuck Russell, Tony Mitchell, Mr. and Mrs. P. Irwin, Lyle Newlin, T. Dan Wollam, K. Hawley, Tom McNerney, Mike Regan, Mark Jochems, Gaile Knutzen, Vanessa Brower, Dan Youra, and Carol Fletcher.

The minutes for February 16, 2005, were approved as submitted.

There were no staff updates to present.

Eileen Rogers asked if it would be possible to get a list of the contracts and costs for the recent studies for the UGA planning. Staff indicated that they could supply the information.

Jim Hagen asked about the number of positions on the LUPEDAP [Land Use Planning and Economic Development Advisory Panel] panel and whether there should be Planning Commission representation on it. Josh Peters responded with an explanation of the purpose of the LUPEDAP panel, stating that it was meant to promote communication between DCD and the economic development community as a whole. He stated that any counsel DCD would receive from the panel would be shared with the Planning Commission. He stated that staff had not envisioned a seat on the panel for a Planning Commissioner, but anyone interested was welcome to attend. Mr. Peters thought that, if the Planning Commission was interested in an ex officio seat like the staff's, it may be possible. He stated that it would be an informal body; there would be no votes taken. It was meant as a way to facilitate communication. He stated that there would be significant Economic Development Council representation on it. Then there would be seats available for members at large who were not necessarily associated with the EDC. Mr. Peters reported that the first meeting was scheduled for March 10 with a breakfast meeting at Fort Worden. He stated that, eventually, staff wanted the panel to focus on the development code. Other topics may be ripe as well, such as in inventory of developable lands. Allen Panasuk asked staff to email the Planning Commission the information about the March 10 meeting.

B. PUBLIC HEARING-2005 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT PRELIMINARY DOCKET

The Chair opened the public hearing and asked staff for their presentation.

Josh Peters explained the Comp Plan amendment process under the GMA and the two types of amendments that were possible. One type was for site specific amendments, which automatically went forward to the Final Docket. The other type was suggested amendments. The suggested amendments received were placed on the Preliminary Docket. Then a public hearing was held by the Planning Commission and a recommendation made to the BOCC about which suggested amendments should go forward to the Final Docket. That was what was happening at this meeting.

Josh Peters summarized the two suggested amendments on the Preliminary Docket, both of which were generated as placeholder amendments by the county. MLA05-66 was proposed for two purposes. One was to address housekeeping issues that arose from the significant amendments to the Comp Plan in 2004. He provided some examples of housekeeping items. Also, there were policy items identified by the BOCC which they wanted to revisit. MLA05-67 was related to the UGA planning and amendments which were adopted in 2004.

Josh Peters reported that the BOCC met on the afternoon of this date. They took a motion directing that MLA05-66 be reduced to just housekeeping issues related to the 2004 update. There would not be a policy component to that file number. The BOCC also took a motion to remove MLA05-67 from the Preliminary Docket.

Josh Peters stated that staff's recommendation was that, since the public hearing was advertised, the Planning Commission continue going through the hearing process as planned and develop a recommendation to the BOCC. He explained that the BOCC would ultimately establish the Final Docket as an official action in any case. He explained that the County Administrator had directed that the placeholder amendments be filed. However, after further discussion, MLA05-67 essentially would not be placed on the Final Docket and MLA05-66 would strictly be for housekeeping issues left over from the 2004 amendments done during the update.

Allen Panasuk commented that the BOCC's action appeared to correlate to the Planning Commission's discussion at the previous meeting. He thought that MLA05-66 would essentially be for housekeeping issues-correcting maps, tables, consistency between chapters, etc. Josh Peters responded that there may be two issues. He stated that there were "housekeeping" things staff was currently doing to try to prepare hard copies of the Comp Plan-logistical type things. That would not be an issue that required a public process. However, mapping corrections may be an issue. He provided the example of a parcel that was rezoned as Ag Lands of Local Importance in 2004 that had a small portion of the parcel inside the UGA. He stated that was not the intent of the Ag zoning. Because we would be changing the land use map, it required a public process. That was the type of housekeeping issues we would consider under MLA05-66.

Jim Hagen asked whether the housekeeping would include amendments to the narrative based on the line-outs that occurred last year. Josh Peters responded that the original intent of the placeholder amendment (MLA05-66) was to include the potential of changes to the narrative. He understood the intent of the BOCC's motion was to reduce the intent of the placeholder to strictly housekeeping types of things. From staff's perspective, it could be about map discrepancies. It could be about flagrant errors in numerical consistency that was not a policy issue. He cited an example of a table from the 1998 Plan that should have been updated during the 2004 update. Mr. Peters stated that, should the BOCC continue with its motion of this date and actually docket MLA05-66 as a housekeeping amendment, he thought their motion to docket would contain the specificity about what that would encompass. He stated that the Planning Commission played a role by recommending to the BOCC about the Preliminary Docket.

Phil Flynn asked about the joint workshop that had been scheduled for March 10 with the BOCC. He wondered whether the workshop would still be held or if it was still necessary. Josh Peters replied that he had not had any

information about the March 10 meeting, whether it was cancelled or not. He stated that he would email the Planning Commission when he received word about it. Mr. Flynn supported holding the workshop in order to hear what concerns the BOCC had and to develop a mutual understanding of the issues that should be addressed. Other commissioners also supported continuing with the workshop.

Bud Schindler asked if staff would rewrite all of the verbiage for MLA05-66 and advertise that MLA05-67 would not go forward. Josh Peters described how the process would work. The BOCC established the Final Docket. If they left MLA05-67 off the docket, there would be no need to discuss it further. And MLA05-66 would be refined and described per the direction of the BOCC.

Eileen Rogers asked if there was anything before the Hearings Board that would affect this years suggested amendments. Josh Peters reported that two petitions had been filed on the 2004 amendment cycle. One was from Washington Environmental Council [WEC] challenging the re-adoption of the current critical areas regulations. Their challenge had to do with the county not properly analyzing best available science and adjusting the critical areas regulations accordingly. The second appeal was by Nancy Dorgan and contained two components. One component had to do with the airport, specifically focusing on the industrial development language. It did not challenge the language about protections for the airport against incompatible development. The second component was about the nexus between some changes in the Comp Plan about industrial land banks and how it related to the development code. The challenge proposed that there was now an inconsistency between the development code and the Comp Plan.

Jim Hagen stated that the WEC appeal was essentially on Part A of MLA04-28. The Nancy Dorgan appeal had to do with the ILB amendments contained in Part B of MLA04-28. Josh Peters agreed, adding that the Dorgan appeal also had to do with the airport ordinance, which was a separate ordinance.

Dennis Schultz stated that, during discussions on the 2004 update, the commission had discussed the lack of clear direction from the state on the critical areas issue. He stated that there had been talk about putting the critical areas issue on the docket for this year, but that had not occurred. Josh Peters suggested delaying that discussion in order to proceed with the public hearing. The other commissioners agreed.

Allen Panasuk stated that he still wished to receive information related to the cost to the county for appeals.

Allen Panasuk opened the public hearing to public testimony by reading the public hearing process. He then invited public testimony.

Judi Morris, Port Hadlock, stated that she was present as chair of Olympic Community Action Programs [OlyCAP]. She explained that their mission was to work with low income people to improve their lives. She stated that she wished to represent those clients at the hearing. She stated that the pressing issues for low income people in our area were housing and a living wage job. She stated that moving forward on implementation of the Hadlock/Irondale UGA would, in part, resolve many of the economic issues of their clients. It would aid in low income housing. It would provide the opportunity for living wage jobs. It would provide for business expansion which would provide for other jobs. It would allow people to shop in their own area, thus bringing the sales tax revenue to our community instead of the

surrounding counties and saving commute time and expense. Ms. Morris stated that there had been discussion about the UGA issue since 1981. She thought plenty of community outreach had been accomplished, along with plenty of studies. She thought it was time to move forward.

Dan Wollam, Port Hadlock, stated that he was Executive Director of OlyCAP. With regard to MLA05-66, he stated that it sounded like it was a fairly routine matter. However, since there were no details upon which to comment specifically, it was hard to have a public hearing on matters that had not been disclosed. While it was probably right to have a housekeeping procedure done, once those details were known, he assumed there would be a follow-up public hearing in order for the public to have input on the specifics. While he understood that MLA05-67 was being withdrawn, he still had some comments to make. He stated that OlyCAP had worked hard for six years to put together a significant affordable housing project for the Port Hadlock community in the area of the UGA. As that process was going forward, he clearly remembered meetings where conditions and issues regarding the UGA relating to their project, and for the future of other housing that could be developed on that site, became very important in large part because of the potential for sewer. He stated that the statutory responsibility of Community Action was to look at and to try to address the life needs of, in particular, the low income population in the community. Provision of affordable housing was one of those critical needs. So was the provision of jobs and other quality of life issues. He stated that he understood that MLA05-67 was being removed from consideration and had more ease at that because of the future potential for development of that area. He stated that other areas of development within the county were, frankly, prohibitively expensive when trying to develop affordable housing. Mr. Wollam stated that when he moved to Jefferson County, he had heard a great deal about the planning that had gone into the UGA. When the UGA was adopted, it was obviously the culmination of many years of work on behalf of many people. There had been money spent now in reliance on the direction the UGA was pointed toward. He stated that their project alone would be an investment of almost \$3 million. Much of that was investment that was done with an eye towards the potential of being able to do other things in the future and provide for expanded housing in the future. He stated that planning was very important, but it was also important to have stability in planning. Once you began in a direction and people started relying on that, and especially when money was being spent in reliance on that, it was very important to not be jerking planning around and reconsidering every other year. That was his fear-that we were about to embark on a reconsideration of the UGA. He stated that he was relieved that it did not appear that was going to happen. He stated that his comments should be taken as appreciation. He wished to reinforce the record, stating that they thought the planning effort had been done and the direction was a good one and they wanted to continue that.

Michael Regan, Irondale, asked if the Planning Commission would be enforcing the three minute rule because he had a statement that he thought would take about six minutes. He stated that he had emailed his statement to DCD late on this date. He submitted a petition signed by about 125 people in the Irondale area supporting saving their rural character and to cut costs for the Tri Area. He read most of his statement into the record. Allen Panasuk stopped Mr. Regan at the 5-minute point. It was noted that the Planning Commission would receive his full statement via email.

Vanessa Brower, Port Hadlock, also represented OlyCAP. She stated that she wished to represent both affordable housing rental and homeownership. She

stated that she was also a citizen of the community and wished to represent the work that had occurred on the UGA over the greater part of a decade and a half. She quoted and paraphrased some of Mr. Hagen's statements from the Planning Commission minutes of February 16 about the Comp Plan supporting a community that was livable, affordable, and sustainable. Other statements addressed the amount of work done by the Planning Commission and others on the UGA issue and the "discretionary" update amendments. She concurred with those statements. She stated that her greatest fear coming to this meeting was that, with the new majority on the BOCC, all of the work that had been done would be undone by a legislative whim. She stated that you did not spend years planning toward the greater good of a community and then just change direction. While she agreed that not everyone would be happy about everything, the effort had to have a broad based affordable, livable, sustainable direction. While it would not be perfect, it would be in the best interests of the group.

Margaret Matheson, Port Hadlock, stated that she was a member of the planning committee that worked on the Tri Area UGA. While there were a lot of things they did not know about, they did their best. She did not think anyone could have worked harder than that planning committee. Ms. Matheson stated that, as a person who had lived in the area for 55 years, she liked the area. While she did not like to see it change, change it must and that was the hard part. She stated that people moved here because they liked the rural feel. Some were retired while others had families with children in our schools. However, they worked somewhere else. Therefore, the money did not come in to support the tax base and to support our schools and everything else that needed to happen for a community. She stated that the area needed more and larger businesses, like the Victorian hardware in Port Townsend. That was the type of business the UGA needed in order to support the people who moved here. If we could do it with balance, it would benefit the whole community. That was what the planning committee planned for and she wished the county would leave it alone.

Lyle Newlin, Port Ludlow, stated that he agreed with the comments received.

Tom McNerney, Brinnon, stated that it took the wind out of his sails when staff reported that MLA05-67 was being taken off the docket. He submitted written comments for the record and read them into the record.

Chuck Russell, a business owner in Port Hadlock, stated that he applauded what the BOCC did by withdrawing the UGA suggested amendment. He stated that the other suggested amendment should have been withdrawn as well. He stated that we really needed to watch what "housekeeping" was, what its definition was. He stated that the UGA was probably one of the most studied issues in the history of the county. He stated that George Huntingford, who was County Commissioner a long time ago, had said that two of his biggest issues and things that he did not accomplish during his tenure were water on Marrowstone and sewers in the Tri Area.

Bob Sokol, Port Townsend, stated that he was speaking as a private citizen. He congratulated the Planning Commission on its work during the 2004 Comp Plan update. He stated that he had attended many hours of BOCC meetings and workshops on the Comp Plan adoption in 1996, 1997 and 1998. He knew that the old plan was full of superfluous verbiage, contradictions, and oppressive policies. He stated that former County Commissioner Richard Wojt had stated during his re-election campaign in 1998 that the Comp Plan was a living document. He stated that the 2004 update had breathed new life into it. Mr.

Sokol stated that, as Mr. McNerney had said, we were "shooting at a moving target", as a result of the BOCC's action, so he would continue his comments for the record. Mr. Sokol stated that the BOCC, without an open public meeting, had thrown a blank ticket via the placeholder to rewrite the Comp Plan. He stated that apparently the staff, without BOCC direction, had picked up the placeholder and gone forward on their own. He commented about the inmates running the asylum. He urged the Planning Commission to not docket any proposed amendments that were not specifically detailed. In other words, give out no "blank checks". He stated that it was especially true because of our 2003 amendments process. He stated that Nancy Dorgan had appealed much of the 2004 work. He estimated that re-doing what had been done in the past would cost the taxpayers in excess of \$200,000. He stated that the cost of appeals, on top of rewriting the Comp Plan, would be cost prohibitive. He stated that it was time for the Planning Commission to look to the future.

Dan Youra, Port Hadlock, stated that he was a business owner in the Hadlock area. As a business owner, he was very encouraged by the work that had been done to get the UGA in place. He wished to reinforce his support for continued efforts to get the UGA in place. He stated that an example of how difficult it was to make decisions as a business owner was the changing zoning. It made it hard to plan for your business. He was looking for stability and consistency in the zoning so that he knew what he could do with his business and commercial property without invading the neighboring residential areas. He stated that he owned commercial property in Lower Hadlock near the Wooden Boat School and property on Rhody Drive. When he heard that the zoning on Rhody Drive might be changing, it got his attention and brought him to the hearing. He concluded by supporting the comments of Mr. Sokol and the representatives of OlyCAP.

Carol Fletcher, Port Hadlock, stated that she owned or managed several businesses in the UGA area. She stated that when she heard that the UGA was going to be revisited again, she became concerned. She stated that she sat on two UGA planning boards. They had gone through a lot of process. She stated that when they had finished, there were people who showed up for the very first time with negative comments. She stated that she would not want to see the county go back and revisit the UGA again. She stated that people were planning and coming to the area. They were starting to think about doing their businesses and progressing with their businesses. That would provide a little bit of tax base. Now, suddenly, according to the rumor, all of Rhody Drive was leaving and the Old Alcohol Plant was leaving the UGA boundary. She had become very concerned. She stated that someone had said there had been \$4 million spent on the UGA over the last twenty years. That was a lot of money and time. Ms. Fletcher stated that we finally had a UGA. She stated that her comment was to just leave it alone and move on.

Dean Straub, Marrowstone Island, stated that they tried to do their business in the Tri Area. He stated that they were active in the Methodist Church and had worked with OlyCAP on the senior housing project. He stated that they liked the area. While it might be a rural area, things and people changed. It seemed like every time the politicians changed, they tried to deviate from the direction that had been taken. He stated that he felt there should be some consistency. He agreed with the previous comments concerning the senior project. He stated that he looked forward to continued growth in this area.

The secretary noted for the record two letters received and handed out to the Planning Commission at the hearing. One was from Lynn Sorenson on MLA05-67 and the other was from Nancy Dorgan on MLA05-66.

There being no further public testimony, the Chair closed the public hearing.

The secretary recommended that the Planning Commission delay making a recommendation to the BOCC on the Final Docket until the next meeting in order for the commissioners to have time to read the written comments received. Jim Hagen agreed and added that the Planning Commission would also have the benefit of the workshop with the BOCC on March 10 before making a recommendation.

C. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL-INDUSTRIAL LAND BANKS

Mark Jochems, President of the Economic Development Council [EDC], addressed the industrial land banks [ILB] issue authorized under RCW 36.70A.367. He stated that he would not address the legal aspects of the statute, but he would address the fundamental aspects of it. He stated that the issue was not necessarily a Port project, but the Port was involved in it.

Mark Jochems addressed the difference between ILBs and Major Industrial Developments [MIDs]. He referred to Lewis County where a large corporation was trying to utilize a large piece of property for one single development for one company's benefit. He stated that the land bank provided us the latitude to open it up to many companies if that was what we wanted to do. But it had to be 95% light industrial. Five percent could be commercial, which would be for support services for the workers, such as restaurants. He stated that it was not a commercial development by any means.

Mark Jochems stated that it was his opinion that the ILB fit Jefferson County to a much better standard than a large MID. He referred to Glen Cove, which was developed in small businesses. He stated that the strength of this county's economy was built on small businesses. Having an ILB would allow us to continue on for many years to have the capacity to allow for small businesses to locate here.

Mark Jochems stated that the statute allowed us to pick two sites for ILBs of whatever size we would like. He stated that the EDC had chosen to stay focused on the one site at the airport because the Port had the ability to generate a revenue producing bond so that the Port could handle the infrastructure costs. He did not think the infrastructure costs would be nearly the burden on the county that it would be for Glen Cove.

Mark Jochems referred to a map of the airport displayed on the wall. He stated that they were proposing fifty plus (50+) acres to be an ILB. He stated that we had until December, 2007, to put forth a firm proposal. He stated that they were still in discussions with CTED about what that proposal was. He assumed it would entail an environmental impact statement [EIS] to address the impacts. He stated that, while there was still a lot of work to be done, there was a very strong will at CTED for this proposal to proceed. He stated that the land bank bill was passed through the House and Senate without any dissenting votes and was signed by the Governor. He stated that the desire from Olympia was for economic growth in light industrial areas. It was an opportunity for small rural counties like Jefferson to designate some land apart from the normal process. He stated that it was up to the Planning Commission to decide which avenue was best to do. He stated that it

was also up to the Planning Commission to decide that there was clearly a need for an ILB.

Mark Jochems referred to some enlarged aerial photos displayed on the wall. He discussed some of the talks that had been occurring between the Port, fire district, Jefferson Transit, and some individual property owners. He offered the opinion that land next to the airport was most suitable for an ILB rather than as residential housing.

One property was owned by Pamela Pepper. Josh Peters stated that Ms. Pepper had submitted a site specific Comp Plan amendment this year to add her property to the Four Corners commercial zone. Mark Jochems stated that they had not had contact with Ms. Pepper, although the Port may have had some contact with her.

Mark Jochems stated that one positive note was that there currently was fire flow to some portions of the subject area. He stated that it would not take a great deal of effort to link the system and have a loop system for fire flow to the whole industrial area. He reiterated that the Port could do the financing through a revenue bond.

Mark Jochems discussed the need for an ILB. He stated that he was offering his own opinions. He stated that he had been told that within the Hadlock/Irondale UGA there was planned twenty years worth of commercial development growth. Considering that and what had been built on Rhody Drive in the last four or five years, he questioned whether there was really twenty years worth of growth in the UGA. Looking at logistics, if the county came up with a sewer system, the property values would go higher and the available commercially zoned property would get snatched up and developed pretty quickly. He therefore challenged whether there was really twenty years worth of growth in the county. Considering Glen Cove, he stated that one of the arguments was that we had 4% worth of growth and we did not need to add 60 to 70 acres of light industrial zoning at this particular time. He admitted that there was still property left. The question was whether there would be property left five or ten years or fifteen years from now. He stated that this was definitely a long range project, but we had a very short window of opportunity to utilize it [the ILB]. He referred to an aerial photo of Glen Cove, stating that it looked like it was about 75% to 80% built out. The questions were what was going on with the remaining parcels and whether there were permits on them. He stated that one of the things the EDC wanted to do, if it could get the money, was to develop an asset data base listing all of the commercial property in the county and Port Townsend. It needed to be a searchable data base so that people could find out who had vacant property and what infrastructure was available on that property. To date we did not have that data base. He stated that the ILB bill was clear that we had to establish a need. That was what they were doing. At a 4% growth rate, the question was whether we needed more land. Mr. Jochems suggested that we did need more and thought the proposal for the land near the airport would provide for the 20-year need.

Mark Jochems displayed a map of the City of Port Townsend's commercial and industrial zoning. He stated that the ILB statute talked about utilizing the land within the existing UGAs and talked about the land bank proposal being in consultation with the UGAs. He stated that the EDC was currently trying to consult with the city. He provided information on the development in the city's areas, stating that the city had a policy in place to defer the cost of infrastructure development onto the developers. He stated that was what

made it so expensive to have a business and build it. He stated that the city did not have a study in place or a plan in place to address the sewage issues for the city's industrial zoning.

Mark Jochems described his marine trades business in the Port's property. He stated that it was a 3,800 square foot building and generated over \$1,000,000 per year and employed nine people. Using a multiplier effect, one could see the revenue you could generate with just small businesses. In the same vein, not everyone wanted to rent from the Port. Some people wanted to own their property, which made Glen Cove perfect for them. He stated that he would never have been able to afford it if he had had to buy the property. He stated that an ILB would create more opportunities for entrepreneurs to come in and create jobs.

Mark Jochems invited questions.

Eileen Rogers asked about the amount of available commercial acreage in Port Townsend. Mark Jochems thought there was ten to twelve acres in the one area off Sims Way. He thought that in time, three to five years, there would be something being developed in the city's industrial area.

Dennis Schultz asked about infrastructure. Mark Jochems provided information on what was available now and what was not available.

Jim Hagen asked when the EDC anticipated the required land inventory being done and what the Planning Commission could do in the meantime to help move the ILB issue along considering the sunset date. Mark Jochems replied that county staff was being very cooperative. He stated that the EDC's budget was a big issue. He stated that they were talking with CTED about some funding sources for the asset data base. He thought there may be some money available through the state, although it was a tight budget year at the state level. While they had done some study by looking at what was on the ground, Mr. Jochems stated that there was no concrete data base. He stated that his feeling was that there were not a lot of resources available for development. He stated that we really had our hands tied for economic development. He stated that the EDC had not been very good at developing the economy because it just did not have the proper tools. He stated that the tools were there now with the adoption of the Comp Plan and UDC; there was more building going on now. He stated that it was really all about creating and retaining jobs.

Mark Jochems stated that there was tremendous support from Senator Hargrove and CTED for the ILB issue. He stated that he would like to see the county provide help on the environmental impact statement. He stated that it was really a county-driven thing. He suggested that the Planning Commission could encourage the BOCC to continue to pursue the ILB siting. He stated that they were trying to get the 2007 deadline extended, but he did not know if they would be successful. He stated that, in the meantime, there was enough time to do something if the will was there.

Phil Flynn asked if the land had to be contiguous. Mark Jochems replied that his interpretation was that it had to be contiguous within itself. He stated that there was one other place, although the EDC was not pursuing it. He stated that the Fred Hill Materials pit was about 75 acres and would revert to residential zoning in the future when the pit closed. That would be a good place for an ILB too. However, there was infrastructure at the airport property, whereas the FHM pit had none. He stated that the EDC thought the airport property was the most reasonable to develop.

Phil Flynn asked whether intervening property could be added to the ILB later. Mark Jochems replied that once the ILB was determined, it was determined. But it was an open topic right now as to what we wanted to consider as the land bank. He stated that if the concern was whether it was enough, we could open up the Fred Hill Materials pit suggestion, although that would take a lot more work. He stated that he would be satisfied if the county could get just the one ILB (at the airport).

Mark Jochems and the commissioners discussed some other areas where there was current industrial zoning and what the uses were currently and whether those areas could be expanded.

Dennis Schultz asked about the issue of businesses in Glen Cove that wished to expand but could not because of development limitations. Josh Peters stated that was more of a UDC issue than an ILB issue. Mr. Schultz wondered whether an ILB could allow bigger buildings. Mr. Peters responded that an ILB would have its own set of development regulations and they would be for major industrial developments.

Josh Peters referred to a handout on a bill analysis. It addressed development regulations that would go with an ILB. He stated that extending the sunset date had been discussed at the last Growth Management Steering Committee meeting. One of the DCD staff had some contacts in Olympia from prior work experience there and had contacted someone there about adding an extension of the sunset date to the current bill. He stated that the current bill was not guaranteed to get out of committee, however.

Mark Jochems stated that he thought the EDC would be having another meeting with CTED soon. He stated that they were not clear on the steps that needed to be taken and hoped to get some clarity and guidance from CTED.

Josh Peters stated that the March 31 planning conference would include the ILB topic. He cited some of the individuals who would fill a panel on industrial lands and possibly there would be a lot of discussion on ILBs. Mr. Peters stated that we now had a Hearings Board decision on MIDs, which could provide some insight into how to deal with an ILB. He noted that Jefferson County had existing provisions for addressing a MID.

Mark Jochems stated that he hesitated to call an ILB a MID. He thought an ILB was different from a MID; it did not take one sponsor. Josh Peters agreed with that assessment.

Jim Hagen asked about the Lewis County proposal. Mark Jochems replied that, in his opinion, the project in Lewis County was basically an MID. It was attracting one large company. He did not think it was totally applicable. He stated that an ILB, as the EDC was defining it and as it fit our needs, was really a totally different thing. He stated that while an MID had been done before and people knew how to do them, the ILB was new. To some degree, Jefferson County would be a pioneer. However, if we did not act, we would be out of luck.

Dennis Schultz asked about the airport property and whether businesses in the ILB would be limited to aviation related uses and whether it would be outside of the Essential Public Facility [EPF]. Bob Sokol pointed out the area of the airport that was purchased with FAA money and where the uses were required to be aviation related. Mr. Sokol stated that the Airport Master

Plan called for aviation related uses and hangar spaces on those lands. Other land adjacent to the EPF were purchased with Port money and could have businesses that were not aviation related.

Kevin Russell explained what had happened in Lewis County. There had been two private groups who were the proponents for the ILB under .367. As the process had evolved, the two proponents had separated. One proposed an MID under RCW 36.70A.365 and the other was continuing to pursue an ILB under .367. He stated that the costs for environmental studies were being incurred by that private group, with the county assisting with the planning.

Mark Jochems stated that it should be clear that, with this proposal, the county would be the driving force. He stated that it would be the county's will that would make it happen. And it would be the county's expense to do the study, although he thought there would be some funding available through CTED to help the county out, because there was the will in Olympia to see it happen.

Phil Flynn suggested that the Planning Commission utilize the March 10 joint workshop with the BOCC to also discuss the ILB issue. Allen Panasuk suggested the commission discuss that after the public comment period.

Mark Jochems stated that the EDC would be holding a workshop with CTED on March 4. They would be discussing the asset data base and also probably the ILB issue.

D. ADJOURNMENT

The Chair invited public comments.

Bob Sokol offered his appreciation for Mr. Jochems' presentation. He stated that he looked at it as opportunity legislation. It could be designated and set up [an ILB] although it might be five years before a client came in. He stated that, anecdotally, the Port received inquiries weekly and monthly from people looking for a fairly significantly sized piece of property. One business built up to 25-foot boats. He stated that if we had something like a land bank set up and ready, we could have had that business here. He stated that a company like that created a lot of jobs. He reiterated that it really was opportunity; it put us in a good position. Mr. Sokol stated that Mr. Jochems had mentioned the inventory. He stated that he had been working with an EDC committee. They had met with county staff. He stated that the GIS staff was going to develop information on the county zoned lands. He stated that it was important to note that an ILB was sited outside of a UGA. Mr. Sokol stated that one of the advantages of the airport was that one of the criteria for an ILB was that it be located near a UGA. He pointed out that the airport was between Port Townsend and the Hadlock/Irondale UGA.

There being no further public comment offered, the Chair closed the public comment period.

Allen Panasuk stated that he had not been contacted by the BOCC chair about the March 10 joint workshop. He stated that he would contact the BOCC chair about the agenda for that workshop.

Josh Peters reported that the April 6 Planning Commission meeting had been scheduled as a joint meeting with the BOCC for the purpose of hearing presentations by the site specific Comp Plan amendment applicants. He

suggested that the Planning Commission could suggest other topics of mutual interest for that meeting as well. That may be in addition to the March 10 workshop on the suggested amendments.

Staff and the commissioners discussed the process and timing for the Planning Commission making its recommendation to the BOCC on the Final Docket.

The commissioners and staff discussed the content of suggested amendment MLA05-66. Josh Peters stated that he would provide information to the Planning Commission prior to the next meeting.

The commissioners reviewed the next meetings: On March 10, the joint workshop with the BOCC on the Comp Plan amendment docket. On March 16, the regular Planning Commission meeting at which the commission would make its recommendation on the Final Docket and hear a presentation on the Latimore Report. Also on March 10, the start-up meeting of the LUPEDAP panel, which would occur before the joint workshop with the BOCC.

The commissioners agreed that they still wished to hold the joint workshop on March 10. Allen Panasuk stated that he would like to raise some of the issues the commission heard at this meeting. One was about affordable housing, low income housing, and jobs. He wanted to hear from the BOCC how they envisioned addressing those issues and where they wanted the county to be in five or ten years. Edel Sokol pointed out that a recent report indicated a 50% dropout rate at our schools. She thought that was a huge issue. Jim Hagen stated that another issue that came up was about maintaining rural character. He stated that one of the GMA definitions of rural character was "fosters opportunity to live and work". He thought the commission had heard that from the public.

The commissioners and staff discussed the issues that may be appropriate as housekeeping that should be addressed under MLA05-66. Josh Peters stated that he would provide a list of such issues for the March 10 workshop.

Josh Peters provided information on the work staff was doing to finalize the Comp Plan.

Since the suggested Comp Plan amendments were either eliminated or modified, the commissioners discussed what topics could be discussed at the joint workshop. Allen Panasuk asked the commissioners to email him with suggestions and he would compile them. His interest was to find out if the Planning Commission was on the same page as the BOCC.

Josh Peters returned to the critical areas question raised by Mr. Schultz. Dennis Schultz stated that his question was that the commission had talked about doing something about the issue this year. He asked whether there were any plans to do it. Mr. Peters responded that, last year, staff developed a best available science report and recommendation for the code. The Planning Commission concurred with the recommendation. He admitted that there wasn't much discussion about it because other things dominated the agenda. The BOCC did not take either the staff's or Planning Commission's recommendation. They simply readopted the current code. The ordinance was appealed. He stated that the county would be discussing the issue by virtue of the appeal.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

These minutes were approved this _____ day of March, 2005.

Allen Panasuk, Chair

Cheryl Halvorson, Secretary