

1 WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL and BELLINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
2 **Special Joint City Council/County Council Work Session**

3
4 November 20, 2007

5
6 County Council Chair Carl Weimer called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. in the
7 County Council Chambers, 311 Grand Avenue, Bellingham, Washington.

8
9 Whatcom County Council Present:

10 Barbara Brenner
11 Dan McShane
12 Sam Crawford
13 Seth Fleetwood
14 Laurie Caskey-Schreiber
15 L. Ward Nelson

Absent:

None

16
17 Bellingham City Council Present:

18 None

Absent:

19 Bob Ryan
20 Gene Knutson
21 John Watts
22 Don Gischer
23 Terry Bornemann
24 Barbara Ryan
25 Louise Bjornson

26
27 **1. WORK SESSION ON BELLINGHAM UGA BOUNDARY AND ZONING**
28 **RECOMMENDATIONS (AB2007-318)**

29
30 Weimer stated the City Council met yesterday and decided to not attend this
31 meeting. City staff are present and will explain.

32
33 Tim Stewart, City of Bellingham Planning Department, stated the City Council
34 discussed the invitation to today's meeting, voted to not accept that invitation, and to send
35 staff instead to discuss options previously presented.

36
37 Weimer asked if the City Council has been briefed on what the County Council
38 passed and why. One reason the County Council wanted a joint meeting was to have that
39 discussion, all be on the same page, and understand the differences. It appears the City
40 Council Members have never been told what the County Council has done and why. Stewart
41 stated the City Council received a copy of the resolution. The Mayor forwarded a response
42 to the County Council regarding the framework for discussions. That framework indicated
43 that City staff would work with County staff on alternatives and recommendations. The
44 staffs were not able to do that. The resolution asked for a reconciliation process. The
45 Mayor's letter agreed, and established a framework for that.

46
47 McShane asked if Mr. Stewart met with County Planning Department staff and the
48 County Council Policy Analyst to talk about options for resolving differences. Stewart stated
49 he has. There were four or five meetings of a number of City and County staff.

50
51 McShane stated the County Council Planning Committee had a meeting last week
52 and talked about a letter with various suggestions. The Planning Committee made a
53 recommendation to introduce an ordinance with findings. He asked if the City Council

1 discussed that or has an opinion on that. Stewart stated the City Council formal action was
2 it's recommendation to the County Council a year ago. It has not taken any other formal
3 action, other than to ask staff to come to this meeting today.
4

5 Weimer stated the County Council has a proposed ordinance that it wants to
6 introduce, but the Council hasn't had a chance to talk with the City Council. He asked if the
7 City Council wants to talk, or if the County Council should just go forward with its proposed
8 ordinance. Stewart stated that is a question for the City Council. Last night, the City
9 Council voted not to accept the County Council invitation and to direct staff to attend this
10 meeting. City staff briefed the City Council on the recommendations in executive session.
11

12 Weimer asked how the County Council is to talk with the City Council, since the City
13 Council isn't allowed to talk to the County Council today. Stewart stated the County Council
14 extended an invitation, and the City denied the invitation. The staffs met and did not reach
15 agreement on any alternatives. The County Council has moved forward with its
16 deliberations. That's where they are today.
17

18 Brenner stated the County has a looming deadline. It sent out the invitation to work
19 with the City Council. The County didn't hear anything for three months. Time is getting
20 critical. She can't read the minds of the City Council Members. Since some are in the
21 audience, she would like to set up a process for the future to have joint council meetings
22 and talk things through. Stewart stated the County Council Committee resolution was in
23 August. The City responded with a letter from the Mayor in September. The City received
24 the County invitation on August 24, and responded on September 19. That's not three
25 months.
26

27 Brenner stated it may have been two months. The County Council Committee made
28 its resolution at the end of July.
29

30 Crawford asked if the City Council position, in the absence of any City Council vote or
31 other statement, is the same as it passed a year and a half ago. No other formal action has
32 been taken to change that. Stewart stated that is correct.
33

34 Crawford stated he is going to assume that, until there is formal City Council action,
35 the City's initial recommendation is the recommendation the County is to consider.
36

37 Tim Douglas, Bellingham Mayor, stated he sent a letter to the County Council that
38 indicated a process by which they can explore alternatives, and staff can exchange
39 information about those two things and inform the councils about those things. Four or five
40 meetings transpired. He's not aware that the City Council got anything from the County
41 Council suggesting any interest in anything proposed. The City did not receive any
42 feedback, having gone through the efforts of putting the options before the County Council
43 through the staffs. The City has had nothing in response from the County Council to inform
44 any change in its position. Yesterday's action was about enabling its staff to share those
45 ideas with the County Council. The City Council wasn't trying to be uncooperative.
46

47 Weimer stated the County Council assumed that the City Council was getting updates
48 on the staff discussions, as the County Council was. The County Council continues to get
49 that feedback from staff, and is ready to talk. It sounds like the City Council didn't receive
50 the same updates from its staff. Stewart stated there has been poor communication
51 between the County and City. There are opportunities for bettering that communication.
52

1 McShane stated the County Council has a letter, identical to the letter the Planning
2 Committee received a week ago. The County Council should discuss the letter now that City
3 staff is present. He asked about the proposal to narrow the gap. He asked if that presumes
4 the same level of safety factor that the City originally recommended, by changing densities
5 in the existing urban growth areas (UGA's), and perhaps adding additional UGA areas to the
6 County's proposal. Stewart stated that did not adjust any assumptions that went into the
7 buildable lands analysis. It did not adjust any safety, household size, or any other of the
8 dozens of assumptions that went into that model. Rather, it looked at the gap that resulted
9 from the analysis and attempted to fill that gap.

10
11 McShane asked if that gap is part of the safety factor that the City adopted. Stewart
12 stated part of the methodology for the buildable lands analysis concluded based upon the
13 safety factors used.

14
15 McShane stated there was a final safety factor. They should focus on the areas
16 where they differ. There is deviation in the Lake Padden and Lake Whatcom watersheds.
17 There is another deviation in the Bakerview Road/James Street UGA. Within the Aldrich
18 Road, Bakerview Road/James Street, and Dewey Valley areas, a minimum density of eight
19 units per acre would be applied as a way to narrow that gap, assuming everything else
20 stays the same. Stewart stated that is one method to narrow the gap.

21
22 McShane stated the County Council is considering following that recommendation of
23 City staff, as one option. Given the City's policy of not extending services into areas until
24 they're annexed, the City has full control of density anyway. It's almost a moot point. They
25 could agree that the minimum densities would be required by the City anyway if the City
26 annexes those areas. Stewart stated the interlocal agreement requires that property be
27 annexed at a comparable zone. The City has the ability to rezone, but that requires a
28 lengthy process. The current standard is to annex at comparable zoning. They work with
29 the existing subarea plan adopted in 1997.

30
31 Crawford asked if that applies to all urban growth areas. Stewart stated it does.

32
33 Crawford stated property owners in the urban residential, mixed use (UR-MX) zone
34 in the Birchwood neighborhood, with a density of six to ten units per acre, have been told
35 they have to have a 20,000 square-foot residential density if annexed. A number of
36 property owners have decided to not pursue annexation because they would lose their
37 density. Stewart stated he's not familiar with that.

38
39 Crawford asked about bullet point four on the last page of the City letter. Currently,
40 the UR-MX zone is six units with a maximum of ten units, if there are purchases of
41 development rights or some other method for gaining density. He asked if the suggestion in
42 that bullet point is to go to a density of eight, with an additional four. At one point, the City
43 would allow services outside the city limits if development were to the maximum density.
44 This doesn't make much difference now. Stewart stated that going to eight units would
45 raise the floor from six to eight units and raise the ceiling from eight to 12 units.

46
47 Crawford stated they don't know where that will end up. One can't build in those
48 areas anyway. In a UR-MX zone without existing water and sewer, people can't get density.
49 This is all theoretical. Stewart stated the City's analysis shows that market forces were
50 pushing development at the lower density. He suggests that they raise the minimum
51 density, not the maximum density, to eight. It might not be eight units across the whole
52 area, but allow higher density areas with careful planning. Do clustering or density
53 averaging.

1
2 Brenner asked if the numbers would change, and require the County to cut back on
3 additions, if it changes to those numbers. Stewart stated there is a gap of some number of
4 people that they're trying to fill. If they change the minimum density, they would
5 accommodate 2,700 additional people.
6

7 Brenner stated the County may not have the same gap that the City has. Stewart
8 stated the City's gap was formally approved by the City Council.
9

10 Brenner asked if the two staffs have looked at and adjusted the gaps. Stewart
11 stated the County changed its gap.
12

13 Caskey-Schreiber stated they are still using their 25 percent safety factor. They are
14 increasing density so they can not have the acreage they originally requested. If the
15 County chooses to increase densities and keep the ten percent safety factor, they don't
16 need to expand the UGA.
17

18 Brenner stated it seems like this is an exercise. The City isn't taking in any more or
19 reducing any more density. She asked if there is anything that precludes the City from
20 increasing density from six to eight. Stewart stated it only requires an increase in process.
21 If already in the subarea plan, that is the zoning in effect at the point of annexation.
22

23 McShane stated the County Planning Committee's recommendation to the County
24 Council is to adopt the City's proposal of the minimum density of eight units per acre.
25 There are a number of other differences. Three UGA's where the County and City were not
26 addressed in the City's letter. The Council added an additional Whereas statement
27 regarding the Hillsdale and Geneva UGA's. The County Planning Committee recommends
28 that a new zone. No additional lots would be created within those existing urban growth
29 areas. He asked if the City takes a position with that. Stewart stated this is the first he's
30 heard of it.
31

32 McShane stated the County Planning Committee strongly recommends that they
33 proceed with the assumption that that area would be rezoned in some manner. They
34 haven't decided what that new zone would look like. The idea is to not create any additional
35 lots in that area, given existing problems. In the future, the City and County would have to
36 have an interlocal agreement to change the zone within those existing UGA's. He asked if
37 that was something in which the City administration would be interested. Stewart stated
38 the City staff would be happy to look at that proposal.
39

40 McShane stated another area where the City and County differed was the Lake
41 Padden urban growth area. The letter from the City was silent. Stewart stated the City's
42 view is the opposite, and the City asks the County to upzone the Yew Street UGA. This is
43 an urbanizing area. They just entered into an interlocal agreement to provide services. A
44 new school is there. There is a good arterial system in place. Consider up-zoning Yew
45 Street.
46

47 McShane stated the environmental impact statement (EIS) for this process says that
48 urbanization is a threat to Lake Padden. He asked if the City's critical areas ordinance
49 (CAO) and stormwater regulations will protect from phosphorus loading in Lake Padden.
50 Stewart stated the issue of natural resource protection is important. The CAO and
51 stormwater regulations will provide protections greater than those provided in the past.
52 Lake Padden is owned by the City's water district, but is used as a recreational facility. The

1 City wants to protect it. The Lake Whatcom watershed is a much higher priority because it
2 is a drinking water supply.
3

4 McShane stated the County Council passed interim development regulations for the
5 Lake Padden watershed, the same as those for Lake Whatcom and Lake Samish, to replicate
6 the same level of protection. He asked if the City would be interested in adopting that as
7 part of the interlocal agreement before expanding into that area. Stewart stated it would be
8 appropriate to include that into the zoning of the subarea plan, which the City would then
9 adopt.
10

11 McShane stated he met with neighbors in one of the built out areas. The neighbors
12 were very concerned about whether they would want to pursue annexation. They felt that
13 the stormwater systems they have in place were inadequate for protecting Lake Padden.
14 They were also concerned that the City's development regulations would be inadequate for
15 protecting Lake Padden, as well. He asked what assurances the County would have of
16 ongoing protection for Lake Padden. He doesn't believe the Department of Ecology
17 stormwater manual, national pollution discharge elimination system (NPDES) permit, City
18 and County critical areas ordinances, and the stormwater regulations are adequate for
19 protecting Lake Padden. They have to go beyond those to protect a lake source. It's a high
20 end recreational source for fishing and swimming.
21

22 Rebecca Craven, Council Policy Analyst, stated the Council Planning Committee did
23 not recommend raising the minimum density.
24

25 Brenner asked if the City could reduce its safety factor instead of rezoning the UR-
26 MX zone. It would save the City from going through the extra process and create options
27 through a paper exercise. Stewart stated the issue of closing the gap doesn't have to be
28 absolute. It can be done through any combination of things. The narrower the gap, the
29 closer they are to an agreement at the edge. If they are truly interested in sprawl, they
30 must figure this out together. The City's options presented a menu of alternatives to
31 consider to narrow the gap. The safety factor is one thing that can change. They could also
32 choose to increase the household size. The City suggests these alternatives as presented as
33 appropriate. They are appropriate also in terms of future transportation planning. It is
34 critical to get the Horton/Van Wyck road system in place. The best way to connect the land
35 use and transportation issues is by working together.
36

37 Caskey-Schreiber stated the City has a high safety factor. The State Department of
38 Community, Trade, and Economic Development (CTED) provided the City options to offset
39 that high safety factor. She asked if the City is willing to reduce its safety factor and meet
40 the County half way. Stewart stated the City staff position is to not have a 25 percent
41 safety factor across the board. Across the board, the City safety factor is 17 percent. The
42 technical work is good, sound, and aggressive about what they can reasonably redevelop.
43 They must assign a redevelopment factor based on what the property owners are willing to
44 do with their properties. That redevelopment factor is also being applied as a safety factor.
45 In other jurisdictions, those have been two separate calculations.
46

47 Caskey-Schreiber stated the City has actually come up with a 50 percent safety
48 factor according to CTED, given its rights-of-way, public facilities, and stormwater. CTED
49 also indicated that the City wouldn't need such a high safety factor if it allows clustering.
50 She asked if the City ever considered reducing it at all. Stewart stated he is concerned that
51 the land analysis hasn't been done countywide. The only analysis done has been for the
52 City of Bellingham, which must defend its methodology without knowing the impact for the
53 rest of the county. Other jurisdictions have done their analyses countywide. He's concerned

1 that reducing the safety factor wouldn't be an appropriate method to reach a policy
2 outcome.

3
4 Caskey-Schreiber stated the County is five years into this process. This exercise will
5 come back in two years. According to her information, the City chose a high safety factor.
6 The County went with a more modest safety factor. The County and City aren't that far
7 apart. They just have a different approach.

8
9 Weimer stated a new City Council and City Mayor will soon be in office. They seem
10 to have a very different view from the current group. He asked if there is any benefit to the
11 process by waiting until January to make the final decision.

12
13 *(Clerk's Note: End of tape one, side A.)*

14
15 Stewart stated he can't answer that question.

16
17 Brenner stated don't treat Whatcom County like King County. They have different
18 problems. Don't treat the small cities exactly like Bellingham. They're different. Stewart
19 stated he agrees. Whatcom County is not a buildable lands county.

20
21 McShane asked why they need to add specific urban growth areas for arterials, given
22 that those areas would require a supplemental EIS. He has difficulty with the east side of
23 Meridian at Van Wyck Road. For that 80 acres north of King Mountain, he asked all if it is
24 necessary to add the arterial. Stewart stated there is a very important connection between
25 the King Mountain five-year review area and the arterial to the north. Adding land for the
26 arterial is to collect traffic impact fees and to get concurrency requirements. If growth
27 occurs outside the city, they aren't able to collect transportation impact fees, and the
28 concurrency ordinance doesn't apply.

29
30 McShane stated that if that 80 acres, Meas/Lipscomb, or Stewart/Smith areas are
31 not included, they wouldn't have anything but a rural level of growth in that area, so they
32 wouldn't have that urban impact. In the future, the City and Council should talk about
33 growth areas in the county that are impacting city streets. A question is whether there
34 could be an interlocal agreement to address that. The County has a similar concern about
35 city growth impacting the county. Stewart stated he agreed there is a gap they should look
36 into.

37
38 Regarding the two properties, most of the debate is focused on the accommodation
39 of residential growth. The City has a serious gap in the availability of industrial land. The
40 City is very concerned. It's very difficult to find buildable industrial land in the city and
41 UGA. That's part of the reason why the City added the second area at Hannegan Road.

42
43 McShane asked how the County would justify doing that without seeing the
44 supplemental EIS. Stewart stated he agreed that they must do a supplemental EIS.
45 Countywide planning policies limited their review only to the five-year review areas. It
46 would be appropriate to take a broader look at the bigger picture.

47
48 Weimer asked about changing the population numbers. That's difficult to do because
49 they both would have to do Comprehensive Plan amendments. Stewart stated that's
50 correct.

51
52 Fleetwood stated some councilmembers would like to introduce the proposed
53 ordinance at this evening's meeting. However, he wants to be committed to the process of

1 trying to work out a compromise. He's not convinced they've given that effort every
2 opportunity. It seems there is still a possibility of the City and County reaching some sort of
3 agreement. He asked if the City people are open to additional discussions in December and
4 January.

5
6 Caskey-Schreiber stated she would like to complete this process by the end of the
7 year. They're going to go through this process again in two years. The City is not going to
8 change its safety factor and many of its assumptions. They've all tried to work out their
9 difference. Now, the County just needs to move on. Learn from the mistakes, and engage
10 each other earlier next time. If the County isn't in compliance with the Growth Management
11 Act (GMA), the County will lose funding. She's not willing to risk that. The County has
12 given the City a lot of opportunity to negotiate with the County. The County Council
13 considered what the City presented. It's not going to happen.

14
15 Alan Marriner, City of Bellingham Assistant City Attorney, stated he is optimistic that
16 agreement with the City is possible. The only change is an agreement to add the 20 acre
17 parcel that the City is purchasing for the Cordata area. They have different assumptions on
18 safety factor. He would like the County Council to consider something more than that 20-
19 acre parcel. There is a significant reason why they would want a grudging compromise on
20 their land supply analysis. There is room for compromise. He anticipates that the Council
21 decision, no matter what it is, will be appealed. The County's decision will be more
22 compelling to the Hearings Board if the County has agreement amongst the local
23 governments impacted by urban growth boundaries.

24
25 Crawford stated the City went through a process that took a number of years and
26 spent a lot of money and time on the analysis of what it needed. He asked if the City would
27 say now that its analysis was wrong. Marriner stated it would not. They could reach an
28 agreement on the additional acres to add to the UGA. The City and Council would come to a
29 compromise on needed acreage. The point of the analysis was to provide options of ways to
30 close the gap. The County may use one option, no option, or any combination of options to
31 close the gap. The City and County council want to reach an agreement with each other.

32
33 Weimer asked if another compromise to close the gap is increasing the minimum
34 density. Marriner stated it is.

35
36 Brenner stated the County has heard from the City Council Members individually. A
37 new Mayor and three new Council Members will change that dynamic. They can keep
38 putting off the decision, but this has received a lot of public process. Don't leave it to next
39 year. The County Council has worked a lot on this issue.

40
41 Fleetwood stated no one's proposing they put this off indefinitely. The Council will
42 approve this before the February deadline. The question is whether the County Council
43 wants to dedicate itself more to a reconciliation process. That might involve several more
44 meetings that result in the possibility of reaching agreement. The courts will consider
45 whether the local governments agree on the results. This is important because the courts
46 are less likely to overturn any decision if the City and County agree.

47
48 Brenner stated there is a reduced chance of any challenges after the first of the
49 year, anyway. She hasn't heard anything new. The County Council needs to go forward.

50
51 McShane stated the City was appealed on the Parks Plan portion of the methodology,
52 and the City prevailed. Subsequently, the City Council talked about the level of service for
53 parks and its ability to pay for that level of service. The revenues would not be there to

1 meet that level in the future. That's one of his concerns about the methodology and how it
2 informed him about the safety factor. That applies with other facilities in other areas. As
3 the city grows, the tendency will be to build up, so the number of acres per population will
4 not be the same. He asked if the City addressed that level of service, even though the City
5 prevailed. Marriner stated the level of service for parks is roughly 47.5 acres per 1,000
6 residents. The City is updating its Park Plan in 2008. The level of service will be adjusted.
7 The acreage number used in the land supply analysis was based on a park manager's
8 analysis. They used 28 acres per 1,000 residents. That's significantly less than the park
9 level of service. Until they go through the Park Plan update, the impacts to the land supply
10 analysis will be difficult to determine.

11
12 McShane stated the County councilmembers are trying to come with a compromise
13 amongst themselves, also. Some were comfortable with a 17 percent safety factor, and
14 others were comfortable with a zero percent safety factor. The County Council is facing a
15 deadline. The process takes a long time. The County has done a tremendous amount of
16 work on this.

17
18 Caskey-Schreiber stated move forward with the current proposed ordinance. The
19 Council puts the County at risk from Futurewise if it changes its assumptions greatly. This
20 ten percent is already her compromise to the City. Adding more to reach an agreement
21 with the City won't put the County in a better legal position.

22
23 Rebecca Craven, Council Policy Analyst, stated the City's land supply analysis doesn't
24 show a shortage for industrial lands, given the City's adopted land availability factors and
25 safety factors for commercial and industrial lands. The committee recommended reducing
26 those factors, so there is no need shown for additional commercial and industrial land.

27
28 Because of the Committee's recommendation to change the safety factor and land
29 ability factor for industrial and commercial lands, they need to accommodate additional
30 population. If they change the minimum zoning in those three areas to accommodate an
31 additional 2,700 people, it will change the calculation of the chosen safety factor. She
32 hasn't done that math yet. Now, they need to accommodate an additional 2,400 people
33 given the recommended safety factor. That's what the recommended additions to the UGA
34 provide. Changes to minimum zoning in the three areas suggested in the City's maps would
35 accommodate an additional 2,700 people, more than what the current safety factor says is
36 necessary. If that's going to happen, they need to reconsider the land supply analysis and
37 findings.

38
39 Caskey-Schreiber stated they are already putting everything they've worked on in
40 jeopardy each time they start trying to accommodate. The County Council has allowed
41 ample opportunity to create a compromise. She's ready to move forward. They've done
42 their homework. The plan is good.

43
44 Brenner stated she agrees with Councilmember Caskey-Schreiber. If there is any
45 chance to make some simple changes for a compromise, she's okay with that. Move
46 forward with the current proposed ordinance this year. The Council has addressed this
47 issue many times. It waited to hear from the City. The County has a deadline and must be
48 efficient. Don't make the staff redo everything over and put them in jeopardy with the
49 Hearings Board.

50
51 **McShane** stated move forward with the current proposed ordinance. The County
52 Council went through the City's recommendations today. There is an institutional difference
53 between how City government and County government operate. At the City, this issue isn't

1 as driven by the City Council as it is at the County. He thanked staff for their work. The
2 City and County aren't that far apart. He **moved** to recommend that the Council introduce
3 the ordinance at this evening's meeting, including the 20 acres of park in the Cordata area.
4

5 Weimer asked why the councilmembers changed their minds about a minimum
6 density of eight units per acre.
7

8 Brenner stated Mr. Stewart stated they can do it after they incorporate the area. It
9 will be more process, but there will be more process whatever they do. Also, she's not
10 there on a minimum density of eight, anyway.
11

12 *(Clerk's Note: End of tape one, side B.)*
13

14 Caskey-Schreiber stated she agrees with Councilmember Brenner. They would have
15 to either change acreage or change the safety factor. They have a balance now that she
16 can defend. They could engage in this back-and-forth exercise, but the City keeps dumping
17 density in the UGA. They should go through that process. At some point, they have to
18 work with the neighborhoods.
19

20 McShane stated the County Councils came to conclusions about zoning densities in
21 Aldrich Road, Bakerview Road, James Street, Dewey Valley, and other areas. With one
22 small change, the County Council agreed with the City's original proposal. The County
23 Council gave a lot of thought to its decision. This seems at the last to be an arbitrary
24 compromise without a lot of thought. He has concerns about whether transportation
25 planning is in place. Many assumptions went into that zoning. They will be close to making
26 a minimum of eight units per acre. He is not comfortable with adding anything to UGA in
27 the King Mountain and Queen Mountain areas. However, those areas would tie in better
28 with the City's proposal in the Bakerview Road/James Street UGA area to create a truly
29 good urban growth area with good transportation connectivity along James Street, which is
30 important. It's important to everyone in that portion of the City. It's important to have a
31 good corridor. It makes more sense for that corridor to evolve in the King Mountain review
32 area. It creates a better opportunity for success in the Bakerview Road/James Street area.
33 He is less comfortable tweaking it at the last minute. They are playing with numbers and
34 not thinking about what's on the ground. They looked at each individual UGA areas
35 carefully to see what would work on the ground.
36

37 Fleetwood stated he won't vote to introduce this ordinance tonight for reasons
38 previously stated. He agrees with Councilmember Caskey-Schreiber that they have a good
39 product. However, the City is willing to continue negotiating within a recognized timeframe,
40 which creates the prospect of an agreement. Try to reach an agreement.
41

42 McShane stated introduce the ordinance tonight for a public hearing on December 4,
43 2007. That doesn't commit the Council to not reaching a compromise. Introduction would
44 notify the City that it has two weeks to present arguments to the County Council that would
45 convince councilmembers to change their minds. He's open to changing his mind if he
46 hears compelling arguments. He hasn't heard any compelling arguments yet.
47 Unfortunately, the County Council had to move forward to force the City to provide any
48 input. The County Council didn't get anything until the Planning and Development
49 Committee meeting last week. He would like to see a rationale for their ideas to close the
50 gap of disagreement.
51

52 ***Motion carried 4-2 with Fleetwood and Weimer opposed and Nelson absent.***
53

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.




Jill Nixon, Minutes Transcription

The Council approved these minutes on _____ March 25 _____, 2008.

ATTEST:

WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL
WHATCOM COUNTY, WASHINGTON



Dana Brown-Davis, Council Clerk



Carl Weimer, Council Chair