

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL  
**Special County Council**

March 29, 2005

Council Chair Laurie Caskey-Schreiber called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 311 Grand Avenue, Bellingham, Washington.

Present:

Barbara Brenner  
Dan McShane  
Seth Fleetwood  
Sharon Roy

Absent:

L. Ward Nelson  
Sam Crawford

**1. COUNCIL TO DISCUSS ISSUES AND CONCERNS RELATED TO THE RECENTLY ADOPTED BUILDING AND SUBDIVISION MORATORIUM IN THE LAKE WHATCOM WATERSHED (ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED INCLUDE: PROCESS, JUSTIFICATION FOR LIFTING THE MORATORIUM, BENCHMARKS, AND PRIORITIZATION OF TASKS) (AB2005-072)**

Caskey-Schreiber stated the memorandum from Amy Pederson regarding low impact development (LID) options was well done. There is opportunity to include some of this expertise into the resource protection overlay. The Council will work on the amendments to Chapter 20.71 that Councilmember McShane proposed during the previous Council work session. The Council will also incorporate the proposed LID options in staff's memo.

Sylvia Goodwin, Planning Division Manager, stated staff may bring forward additional LID options.

Brenner asked if Dr. Easterbrook's memo commented in general or specifically on Councilmember McShane's proposed changes.

McShane stated the comments were partly directed toward the clearing ordinance. There were also comments on some of the discussion about the water resource protection overlay. Dr. Easterbrook has a concern about lawns, with which he agrees. It's a complicated problem. Phosphorus fertilizer is something Dr. Easterbrook wanted to emphasize. He doesn't quibble with that issue. There is a contrary opinion out there that phosphorus is rare in soil, but that's untrue. Phosphorus is one of the most common elements in rocks. A mineral called apatite is a phosphate mineral that is virtually in all rocks. That doesn't mean it's available for grass. It is not mobile and may not be picked up by the lawn. Councilmembers must understand that phosphorus is not rare. It is present throughout the environment, and is certainly present in earth materials.

1  
2 Brenner stated she talked to Dr. Easterbrook, who said it's not a very  
3 common mineral.  
4

5 McShane stated a text called the Manual of Mineralogy (after James D. Dana)  
6 explains apatite and specifically states that apatite is common in almost all rock  
7 types. Phosphorus is always tested for in rocks when rocks are analyzed. It always  
8 shows up as a percent, not parts per million. It usually shows up at about one  
9 percent, which is not rare. His point is that the statement is untrue that  
10 phosphorus is rare in soil, doesn't exist, and isn't a problem in the lake as a  
11 contributor. It is present in soil. Putting in development standards that address  
12 soil runoff into the lake is one solution to reduce phosphorus loading in the lake.  
13 It's not the only solution. Dr. Easterbrook had some other very good suggestions  
14 in his letter.  
15

16 Brenner stated Dr. Easterbrook's letter doesn't say phosphorus is rare, just  
17 that it contains very small amounts, which is what Councilmember McShane just  
18 said. Dr. Easterbrook didn't say that phosphorus is rare and not in the soil. She's  
19 frustrated because she's getting conflicting information. She would like Dr.  
20 Easterbrook to address the Council.  
21

22 McShane stated he's not conflicting with Dr. Easterbrook. He's simply stating  
23 that phosphorus is in soils. According to his interpretation of the letter, Dr.  
24 Easterbrook implied that phosphorus is extremely rare. Someone else may have a  
25 different interpretation.  
26

27 Caskey-Schreiber stated the Council will work on the proposed ordinance.  
28 Dr. Easterbrook is welcome to address the Council at a future meeting. The issue  
29 now is this chapter.  
30

31 Brenner stated the Council should invite Dr. Easterbrook to make a  
32 presentation to the Council.  
33

34 Caskey-Schreiber asked Councilmember McShane to explain his proposal to  
35 strike language in Whatcom County Code (WCC) 20.71.051.  
36

37 McShane stated an identified source of nutrient loading in the lake is  
38 agriculture. As supportive as the County is of agriculture, it's not an appropriate  
39 land use within a drinking water watershed.  
40

41 Brenner stated concerns about agricultural use is covered with setbacks.  
42 Agriculture is a historic use. It's not a big use in the watershed. If the Council  
43 approves this language change, the next step would be telling people they couldn't  
44 have pets in the watershed.  
45

46 Roy stated she would support not having agriculture as a permitted use.  
47 Agriculture, including animal husbandry, is a specific activity. The Council is

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1 proposing a ban on phosphorus fertilizers, yet is saying horticulture is a permitted  
2 use. Either the Council does or does not want these elements allowed in the  
3 watershed. She supports removing the language. There are plenty of other  
4 agricultural places in the county.  
5

6 McShane stated existing agricultural uses would be allowed to continue as  
7 nonconforming uses. He is aware that an individual in the watershed started a  
8 small veal farm fairly close to the lake. The preferred land use is forestry. There is  
9 quite a bit of rural land in the watershed. There is a risk of converting forestry land  
10 to agricultural pasture land and animal husbandry, which entails importing nutrients  
11 to feed the animals. Those nutrients won't leave the watershed.  
12

13 Brenner stated they could increase setbacks and allow horticulture,  
14 floriculture, and crop cultivation without the use of phosphorus.  
15

16 Caskey-Schreiber stated they could keep some of the language, "Agriculture  
17 including animal husbandry, horticulture... All new and preexisting agricultural  
18 uses, other than structures, with two to five animal units shall comply with the  
19 setbacks established in the critical areas ordinance unless they have completed and  
20 implemented a conservation plan which provides for a smaller buffer." They have a  
21 lot of rural, one unit per five acres (R5A) zones in this area. One can allow animals  
22 with buffers that reduce contribution to sediment loading, including phosphorus.  
23 It's currently being done in the watershed. The Backcountry Horsemen  
24 organization has put a lot of time and money into the Y Road trails. Accessing  
25 those trails is one of the reasons people choose to live in that area. She doesn't  
26 see any harm in letting existing facilities continue. It will be difficult to say people  
27 need to get rid of their animals.  
28

29 McShane stated that if the Council is interested in allowing agriculture and  
30 animal husbandry in the watershed, allow it as a conditional use to make  
31 enforcement easier. Don't allow it to the permitted section.  
32

33 Caskey-Schreiber asked about preexisting uses.  
34

35 McShane stated preexisting uses would be nonconforming uses.  
36

37 Goodwin stated preexisting uses are allowed to continue. For clarity, add the  
38 use as an accessory use to a house. Make the policy clear on horses. If a horse is  
39 present as a recreational use, make the code clear. If the Council allows the use  
40 through a conditional use permit, administrative approval to register and track the  
41 horses would be easier.  
42

43 McShane stated the purpose is to keep agriculture from being an outright  
44 permitted use. If the Council is interested in allowing all types of agriculture  
45 activities, they need some constraints on the use so it would not be outright  
46 permitted. It might be appropriate to make agriculture as a conditional use, with  
47 conditions and constraints. If the Council is not interested in dropping any

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1 agricultural activity from the watershed, then there is no need to work further on  
2 that subject. It sounds like they want to put some conditions on agriculture.  
3 Therefore, craft something in the conditional use section of this ordinance.  
4

5 Brenner asked about someone with five acres that is farmed and is not for  
6 sale.  
7

8 McShane stated hog farms and dairy farms are outright permitted in the  
9 watershed currently. An alternative would be to not permit them outright. It  
10 would be okay to allow some crops or a couple of horses, but a horse feeding lot  
11 would not be okay. The Council could allow some flexibility.  
12

13 Caskey-Schreiber stated she could support removing agriculture from  
14 permitted uses. She would like to allow two to five animal units as an accessory  
15 use. Five acres is more than enough land to have a small operation. Goodwin  
16 stated appendix A of the critical areas ordinance allows preexisting agriculture with  
17 a farm plan and setbacks.  
18

19 McShane stated the question is the level of tolerance for farming or  
20 agricultural activities that are okay in the watershed.  
21

22 Caskey-Schreiber stated the Council could get good information from the  
23 Cooperative Extension office. One could manage two to four horses on five acres  
24 just fine. More than that would require a farm plan.  
25

26 Brenner asked the number of animal units assigned to a horse. Goodwin  
27 stated one horse equals two animal units. One cow is one animal unit. Horses eat  
28 and poop a lot more than cows.  
29

30 McShane stated they could get more information so they know a good  
31 stocking rate for watershed protection. This is just a draft that is not even being  
32 introduced yet. Goodwin stated the Planning Commission is discussing this same  
33 issue to clarify the chart on animal units in the code. The Planning Commission is  
34 talking about decreasing the number of animal units on very small parcels. Put this  
35 issue aside and ask the commission for a recommendation, or get John Gillies to  
36 give the Council the same information.  
37

38 Caskey-Schreiber asked staff to talk invite John Gillies to attend the next  
39 Council work session.  
40

41 Brenner stated this isn't something that needs to be done before the  
42 moratorium is lifted. The Council has all summer to work on it. She asked if the  
43 Agricultural Advisory Committee could work on this.  
44

45 Caskey-Schreiber stated this is a watershed issue, not an agriculture issue.  
46

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1 Roy stated there are some things that are imperative to do before May 1, but  
2 this is not one of them. They don't have to put extreme pressure on themselves.  
3 Watershed protection is not an area of expertise of the Agricultural Advisory  
4 Committee. Councilmember McShane is getting a sense that the Council wants to  
5 allow some agricultural uses in the watershed. She can be convinced to not allow  
6 any agricultural uses in the watershed. The Council will probably end up with a  
7 compromise.

8  
9 McShane stated the Council needs to make sure this gets done. The Council  
10 has to deal with State Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) when it brings  
11 forward this ordinance. The odds of getting this done by the time the moratorium  
12 is over is becoming impractical.

13  
14 Fleetwood stated he is not yet sold on agricultural being entirely removed  
15 from a permitted use. The idea of making agriculture a conditional use is  
16 interesting. The subject matter is clearly tied to moratorium response. The  
17 justification is for lifting the moratorium is stricter building codes, which relate to  
18 the low impact development memorandum from staff. The Council must establish  
19 criteria to use to measure whether a proposed interim ordinance is necessary for  
20 lifting the moratorium. Consider proposed criteria, which will guide the Council in  
21 the next month as it decides what is and is not necessary for lifting the  
22 moratorium.

23  
24 Caskey-Schreiber referenced the proposed changes to section 20.71.300(3).  
25 She asked if this is the section in which the Council could place an incentive or  
26 bonus for maintaining mature conifers.

27  
28 McShane stated this is the correct section. The current language in that  
29 section talks about landscaping in general, but not water quality protection. The  
30 goal of having open space areas in the watershed as part of development is about  
31 water quality. The use shouldn't be clouded with anything else. Put an emphasis  
32 on native conifers because of their ability to intercept water through an area.

33  
34 Caskey-Schreiber stated having native conifers planted on 30-foot centers  
35 doesn't sound native. It sounds like one is replacing what is destroyed. She  
36 suggested maintaining what is there naturally.

37  
38 McShane stated the reference to 30-foot centers is a reference to tree  
39 density. If there is an open space area without trees, it would need to be planted.  
40 A forested area wouldn't need to be planted because the trees are already there.

41  
42 Caskey-Schreiber stated that the language sounds like the County is  
43 mandating exactly 30-foot centers, without allowing more tree density.

44  
45 Goodwin stated the reason the current language says, "or landscaped per  
46 Whatcom County" was because staff was concerned that bare ground or  
47 undesirable vegetation could be maintained. That is not desirable. Split the

1 language into two sentences. Natural vegetation should be maintained where  
2 natural vegetation exists. Replace bare ground or ground with invasive species  
3 with desired vegetation. They don't want to dictate that someone must remove all  
4 blackberries and replace them, but provide incentive to replace undesired  
5 vegetation with vegetation that is better for water quality.

6  
7 Brenner stated make it an encouragement rather than a mandate.

8  
9 McShane stated he defers to staff's suggestion. If there are non-native  
10 invasive plants, it's difficult to make someone take care of a problem they may  
11 have inherited. Tearing out the invasive species could be worse. Just keep it from  
12 ruining the trees. He liked Ms. Goodwin's suggested language.

13  
14 Caskey-Schreiber stated staff could come up with revised language at the  
15 next meeting.

16  
17 Caskey-Schreiber referenced subsection .302(3).

18  
19 McShane stated he proposes the original staff recommendation, which makes  
20 sense.

21  
22 Caskey-Schreiber asked about geographical information system (GIS)  
23 capability to figure out how much impervious surface already exists. Goodwin  
24 stated she would bring forward that information. Staff has information on the  
25 amount of impervious surfaces by basin.

26  
27 Brenner stated she wouldn't support the change from 2,500 square feet to  
28 2,000 square feet of impervious surfaces. The extra 500 square feet will not make  
29 much difference to the watershed overall, given the areas that are left to develop,  
30 but it will make a difference to the people trying to build.

31  
32 McShane stated a different approach relates to the amount allowed currently  
33 for an impervious footprint. Look at the memo regarding LID. A question is how to  
34 tie low impact development into the code.

35  
36 *(Clerk's Note: End of tape one, side A.)*

37  
38 McShane continued to state that the goal is to reduce the amount of  
39 phosphorus heading into the lake. Impervious surfaces plays a big role in that  
40 amount. If there are a lot of impervious surfaces, the runoff rates are higher and  
41 the amount of infiltration concentrated in one area of the property, which increases  
42 discharge rates to streams. A different approach is to look at the effective surfaces  
43 that increase phosphorus loading in the lake. The type of pavement used becomes  
44 a factor. Lawns also are a factor in runoff efficiency, which is different from forest  
45 and native material. Set a level of 2,000 square feet of impervious surfaces. The  
46 rooftop would count against that amount. The County could issue a credit for

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1 mitigation elsewhere on the property. The problem with this option is managing it.  
2 A question is whether the Council is interested in looking at that angle.  
3

4 Caskey-Schreiber stated the Council must get more information from staff on  
5 this option. As they delve into the rest of the LID options, the Council could maybe  
6 take another look to build more incentives for using other uses.  
7

8 Brenner stated it would be a nightmare for the staff to figure out those  
9 numbers. Instead, go with low impact development. The Building Industry  
10 Association (BIA) and Sustainable Connections have workshops on low impact  
11 development. In the watershed, the Council could require low impact development,  
12 which says someone must either do it a certain way or come up with some way  
13 that is comparable. The Council could approve that rather than the square footage  
14 option.  
15

16 Caskey-Schreiber stated staff will come back with more information. The  
17 Council will incorporate low impact development in the ordinance.  
18

19 McShane stated a green roof built via low impact development would count  
20 as a credit toward the total amount of impervious surfaces. Reducing impervious  
21 surfaces is low impact development.  
22

23 Caskey-Schreiber referenced section .302(8). Add something that gets  
24 toward the low impact development.  
25

26 McShane stated the new section (8) isn't meant to replace the old section  
27 (8). It's just a numbering issue. The old subsection (8) is addressed in the  
28 alternative surfacing methods section.  
29

30 Brenner stated gravel can be very pervious. Don't take it out. One can have  
31 gravel that is very pervious. The 50 percent value was a compromise.  
32

33 Caskey-Schreiber referenced subsection .603, which addresses the removal  
34 of section .302(8).  
35

36 McShane stated that section allows gravel as an alternative surface if its  
37 demonstrated that rainwater hitting the covered area will infiltrate through the  
38 surface for the two-year, 24-hour storm event. If the gravel driveway is installed  
39 to allow rainwater to infiltrate to that level, it would be allowed.  
40

41 Brenner stated that's what they'd expect from a pervious surface. Gravel is  
42 counted as 50 percent pervious. There should be a 50 percent demonstration of  
43 perviousness.  
44

45 Caskey-Schreiber asked Councilmember McShane's reason for removing  
46 subsection .302(8).  
47

1           McShane stated the information he has doesn't support it. It's arbitrary and  
2 not consistent with protecting water quality. There is no incentive for someone to  
3 put in a gravel driveway appropriately. A gravel driveway could be installed and  
4 work the same as a paved road, and the builder would receive a 50 percent  
5 reduction. Someone who does a really good job of putting in an appropriate gravel  
6 surface gets no reward whatsoever. This subsection is not fair and offers no  
7 incentive.

8  
9           Caskey-Schreiber asked staff to comment on encouraging permeable  
10 pavement.

11  
12           Goodwin stated an incentive for people to put in pervious pavement is if  
13 gravel isn't treated as pervious. Staff would want some way to measure whether  
14 pervious pavement or cinderblock driveways are properly installed. She is  
15 concerned about someone having to demonstrate perviousness. Instead, say that  
16 the surface must be designed to be pervious. She doesn't want staff out in the field  
17 with a hose trying to calculate how pervious is a surface. A good way to go would  
18 be to say that the surface must be designed and certified. Past demonstrations  
19 shown that a properly installed gravel driveway would allow infiltration.

20  
21           Caskey-Schreiber stated the current language doesn't say anything about a  
22 properly designed gravel driveway. Goodwin stated that is correct. Eliminating the  
23 current subsection .302(8) makes the choice of surface either pavement or a  
24 designed alternative surface of block.

25  
26           Brenner stated gravel is pervious. Some gravel gets less pervious as it ages,  
27 but it's still pervious. There is never a point where gravel becomes impervious.

28  
29           Caskey-Schreiber stated King County considers gravel impervious.

30  
31           Brenner stated that, factually, gravel is never impervious.

32  
33           McShane stated he's not debating that. He's simply saying that gravel would  
34 be an alternative surface method. If the design of the gravel driveway allows  
35 infiltration of the specified storm event, then the gravel driveway would be allowed.  
36 Encourage alternative surface methods as much as possible. Encourage people to  
37 put in gravel driveways in a way that they function and meet the goals of the  
38 chapter.

39  
40           Roy stated the design matters. As one of the councilmembers who voted for  
41 the 50 percent pervious for gravel, she would accept this kind of distinction. The  
42 two-year storm event seems reasonable. She asked if that is consistent with  
43 requirements for other kinds of pervious surfacing, such as the pervious paving  
44 blocks. The regulations must be consistent.

45  
46           McShane stated his intent is that all alternatives meet the same standards.  
47

1 Brenner asked if there is a design for gravel to do this.  
2

3 Joe Rutan, County Road Engineer, stated that in road construction, they use  
4 free-draining gravel to drain and be pervious. Three-quarter inch crushed  
5 limestone with a lot of fines, when the fines get wet, sets up like concrete. There  
6 are varying ranges of runoff coefficients, based on slopes and other factors. In his  
7 experience, maintenance is very important and the key for long-term success. The  
8 designs are good when installed. Once people move in, owners do work that  
9 degrades the design.

10  
11 Brenner asked about a two-year 24-hour storm event for measuring  
12 permeability. Rutan stated it is a reasonable frequency to look at things like this.  
13 It seems to fall in line with other criteria where they use that storm event for sizing  
14 facilities.

15  
16 **Caskey-Schreiber moved** to remove the existing item .302(8)  
17

18 **Motion carried 4-1 with Brenner opposed.**  
19

20 **Caskey-Schreiber moved** to amend .603, "...shall not be considered  
21 impervious surfaces under WCC 20.71.300 if it is designed so all rain water hitting  
22 the covered area will be infiltrated through the surface for the two-year, 24-hour  
23 storm event."  
24

25 **Motion carried unanimously.**  
26

27 **Caskey-Schreiber moved** to add to subsection .302, "(8) Within the Lake  
28 Whatcom watershed, lawn areas exceeding 500 square feet will be counted as  
29 impervious unless some low impact development standards, such as filter strips,  
30 bio-retention swales, bogs, are in place."  
31

32 McShane stated he's leery of the language Councilmember Caskey-Schreiber  
33 added to his language. Rewrite the section to incorporate green building standards,  
34 but don't call out something that specific. The purpose of his proposed amendment  
35 is because he's concerned about the fact that lawns are a potential contributor to  
36 water quality problems for a number of reasons.  
37

38 Amy Pederson, Planner I, stated the Fire Marshal has a response to this  
39 language. In areas such as Sudden Valley, they are working hard with builders in  
40 the community on defensible space. That is the concern with that threshold.  
41 Defensible space is about keeping trees away from the house for fire protection  
42 purposes.  
43

44 Brenner stated that would be taken care of by the ban on phosphorus  
45 containing fertilizers. She won't support the motion.  
46

47 McShane stated he would not support the motion.

1  
2           ***Caskey-Schreiber withdrew the motion.***  
3

4           ***Caskey-Schreiber moved*** to add language to section .302, "(8) Alternative  
5 surface methods described in Whatcom County Code 20.71.603 may be used."  
6

7           ***Motion carried unanimously.***  
8

9           Caskey-Schreiber asked if the cluster design standards section can be  
10 manipulated to discourage subdivisions. Pederson stated the Planning and  
11 Development Committee is looking at this code section at its meeting later in the  
12 afternoon.  
13

14           Caskey-Schreiber referenced subsection .700 regarding roads, curbs,  
15 gutters, and sidewalks. It is best to get away from having curbs. She asked if  
16 something could be added to this subsection to discourage the use of curbs. Rutan  
17 stated an effective means of road stormwater treatment is filter strips of biological  
18 material. There are other things that a curb does. It collects drainage and also  
19 provides a clear zone. On a 35 mile per hour or less road, there cannot be any  
20 fixed objects higher than six inches within ten feet of the traveled lane, which  
21 includes things like mailboxes and signs. When there is a six-inch vertical curb, the  
22 clear zone is now 18 inches. That allows mailboxes and signs. It provides a  
23 modicum of protection for pedestrians. There is no doubt that a very effective  
24 means of stormwater treatment is a filter strip. It is a federal law adopted by the  
25 State. The County must follow federal and State guidelines when any project  
26 includes federal or State money.  
27

28           Brenner stated the County could reduce the curbs on a lot of roads that don't  
29 involve State or federal money.  
30

31           Caskey-Schreiber stated the low impact development items in staff's memo  
32 addresses the role of curbs in stormwater runoff. She asked if the County can  
33 implement something like this only in the watershed. Rutan stated the County  
34 could implement this in the watershed. It's very important for safety to provide an  
35 appropriate clear zone and recovery area. There are designs to allow for a clear  
36 zone and control runoff.  
37

38           Caskey-Schreiber asked Mr. Rutan to develop draft language to reduce the  
39 velocity of runoff.  
40

41           Brenner stated language must also reduce the amount of impervious surface.  
42 Don't require large width and sidewalks on County roads.  
43

44           Rutan stated the County currently allows reduced cross sections for special  
45 districts. He also incorporated the City of Bellingham's Lake Whatcom watershed  
46 road standards for a couple of County projects. A benefit of not having a curb is

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1 not having a catch basin and a subsurface system. An above-ground surface is  
2 cheaper to construct and maintain.

3  
4 Roy asked if the filter strip could also be a safety zone. Rutan stated it  
5 could.

6  
7 Roy stated she would not be upset to see proposals with no sidewalks. The  
8 issue with the fire department comes up. There are low impact development  
9 standards that fire departments can approve. Incorporate those options. Include  
10 the fire department in the discussion. Rutan stated he can do that. There are two  
11 purposes to a curb, and he wants to make sure they address both things.

12  
13 McShane asked about one minor change to section 20.71.400 to reduce  
14 setbacks for different road classifications. Rutan stated the first issue might be  
15 with utilities. They will want to look at that. Ten-foot widths may be of concern  
16 when there are cable and gas lines. It's very hard to open cut a road and then get  
17 it back together, however it's something they should look at.

18  
19 McShane asked Mr. Rutan to look at that issue. Overall, the County is taking  
20 steps to reduce density. The amount of new utilities going in should be minimized.  
21 Rutan stated having shorter driveways that serve multiple houses is an effective  
22 way to cut down on impervious surfaces.

23  
24 Caskey-Schreiber stated the Council will meet again on this issue next  
25 Tuesday at 10:00 a.m.

26  
27  
28 **OTHER BUSINESS**

29  
30 There was no other business.

31  
32  
33 **ADJOURN**

34  
35 The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

36  
37  
38  
39 \_\_\_\_\_  
40 Jill Nixon, Minutes Transcription

41 The Council approved these minutes on April 12, 2005.

42  
43 ATTEST:

WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL  
WHATCOM COUNTY, WASHINGTON

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1  
2  
3  
4

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dana Brown-Davis, Council Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Laurie Caskey-Schreiber, Council Chair