

# Public Participation Plan

Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan ■ Growth Management Periodic Review ■ May 2010



# Table of Contents

---

<b>Chapter 1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1. Public Participation Plan Format.....	1-3
<b>Chapter 2. The Issues .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1. Statutory Requirements.....	2-1
2.2. Reconciliation Items .....	2-2
2.3. Docketed Amendment Requests .....	2-3
2.4. Urban Growth Area Review Appeals .....	2-4
<b>Chapter 3. Project Participants .....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1. The Public .....	3-1
3.1.1. Interested Property Owners and Developers.....	3-1
3.1.2. Community Organizations .....	3-1
3.1.3. Other Groups and Individuals .....	3-2
3.2. Governmental/Quasi-Governmental Groups .....	3-2
3.2.1. Planning Commission.....	3-3
3.3. The Cities .....	3-3
<b>Chapter 4. Public Participation Approach .....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1. Overall Approach.....	4-1
4.2. Public Participation Information Sheet.....	4-1
4.3. Level 1 Issues .....	4-2
4.3.1. Approach .....	4-2
4.3.2. Level 1 Issues.....	4-2
4.4. Level 2 Issues .....	4-3
4.4.1. Approach .....	4-3
4.4.2. Level 2 Issues.....	4-3
4.5. Level 3 Issues .....	4-4
4.5.1. Approach .....	4-4
4.5.2. Level 3 Issues.....	4-5
<b>Chapter 5. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>Appendix B .....</b>	<b>B</b>

# Appendices

---

- A. Sample Public Participation Information Sheet
- B. Public Comment/Response

## Chapter 1. Introduction

Whatcom County has initiated a multi-year project to update its Comprehensive Plan by December 1, 2011, as required by the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA). The County is required to review and revise its comprehensive plan and development regulations every seven years [RCW 36.70A.130(1)]. The RCW states:

*"...Except as otherwise provided, a county or city shall take legislative action to review and, if needed, revise its comprehensive land use plan and development regulations to ensure the plan and regulations comply with the requirements of this chapter..."*

According to RCW 36.70A.130(4), Whatcom County is required to complete its next seven year update December 1, 2011. This deadline was extended to December 1, 2014 with the last legislative session's passage of SSB 6611. The update will represent the county's vision for the next twenty years.

This Public Participation Plan (PPP) is intended to guide the County in completing the 2011 comprehensive plan update and is required by state law (RCW 36.70A.140). The act states:

***"36.70A.140 Comprehensive plans - Ensure public participation. Each county and city that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall establish and broadly disseminate to the public a public participation program identifying procedures providing for early and continuous public participation in the development and amendment of comprehensive land use plans and development regulations implementing such plans. The procedures shall provide for broad dissemination of proposals and alternatives, opportunity for written comments, public meetings after effective notice, provision for open discussion, communication programs, information services, and consideration of and response to public comments."***

The bolded sentence of RCW 36.70A.140 above guided the County in developing this PPP. Prior to implementation, this plan will have crossed the eyes of the public, the planning commission,

and the county council. All of these parties will have shaped its final form and the plan will be implemented as the public and its representatives have suggested, whenever applicable and reasonable.

The issues that will be considered as part of County's periodic review and update to the comprehensive plan are divergent and far-reaching. A one-size-fits-all approach to this public participation plan for all of these very different types of issues would not be effective and would do a disservice to the residents of Whatcom County.

This PPP outlines the public participation approach that will be taken with each issue rather than a generic overall approach. Some issues will require a lot of public participation, others will require a different approach for various reasons. The objective of this plan is to provide a clear process for each issue so residents can easily determine how best to be involved in the issues they care about most.

Consistent with GMA, the update will involve:

- Reviewing and revising the comprehensive plan and development regulations to be consistent with the state growth management laws adopted since the last comprehensive plan update in 2004, specifically:
  - Best available science for the protection of critical areas [RCW 36.70A.130(1)(c)];
  - Review of mineral resource land designations and development regulations (RCW 36.70A.131), and;
  - An analysis of the population allocated to a city or county from the most recent ten-year population forecast by OFM [RCW 36.70A.130(1)(c)];<sup>1</sup>
- Proposing amendments to ensure that the comprehensive plan is internally consistent, specifically for issues identified during the UGA review and revision process;
- Review and update for housing, capital facilities and transportation systems inventory;
- Implementing a public participation program that provides for early and continuous public participation in the periodic review, and;
- Defining within the PPP the role of the planning commission in the periodic review process.

***The PPP is designed to meet the following objectives:***

- Provide a roadmap for the public, outlining a clear and accessible public process through December 1, 2011;
- Ensure input is from a broad base of public participants and is elicited in a timely fashion, considered, and incorporated as appropriate into the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulation updates; and

---

<sup>1</sup> This item was already completed as part of the 2009 Urban Growth Area Review and Update. It is not intended to be addressed again as part of the periodic review. The next Office of Financial Management projection is not anticipated until 2012.

- Make a concerted and continuous effort to ensure that elected officials and staff are fully aware of and understand community and stakeholder concerns.

## 1.1. Public Participation Plan Format

This document is designed to be read straight through from beginning to end. In addition to this plan, each project will have a public participation information sheet (Appendix A) which is described in section 4.2. To meet PPP objectives consistent with GMA goals, the remainder of this document addresses the following:

- Outlines the **issues** that will be considered;
- Identifies the potential project **participants** in the comprehensive planning process, and;
- States the **approach** that will be taken with each issue.



## Chapter 2. The Issues

The issues that this Comprehensive Plan update will address throughout 2010 and 2011 can be divided into three categories: statutory requirements, reconciliation items, and docketed requests. This section of the PPP outlines these issues, within these categories. Each issue has been assigned a number beginning first with an “S”, “R” or “D” for “statutory”, “reconciliation” or “docket” respectively. These numbers will carry with each issue to Chapter 4 of this document. Chapter 4 will go into greater detail on the public participation approach that the County will take on each of these issues.

### 2.1. Statutory Requirements

The County has identified the following issues as those requiring attention during the 2011 update process in order to comply with the changes in state Growth Management law that have occurred since the last Comprehensive Plan update in 2004. The following are identified statutory requirements:

- S-1. **Physical Activity Amendments** (RCW 36.70A.070, SSB 5186) – Increasing the physical activity of the citizens of Washington State. The Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan must contain a pedestrian and bicycle component that includes identified planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors to enhance community access and promote healthy lifestyles.
- S-2. **Multimodal Concurrency Amendments** (RCW 36.70A.108, 2SHB 1565) – The amendments specify that concurrency compliance improvements or strategies may include qualifying multimodal transportation improvements or strategies.
- S-3. **Mineral Resource Lands** (RCW 36.70A.131) – Review of mineral resource land designations and development regulations.

- S-4. **Land for Facilities** (RCW 36.70A.110, .115, .210, SHB 1825) – Identifying specific facilities planning requirements under the growth management act. Each city within a county fully planning under the Growth Management Act must identify areas sufficient to accommodate the full range of needs and uses that will accompany projected urban growth.
- S-5. **Accessory Uses in Agricultural Lands** (RCW 36.70A.177, SHB 2917) – SHB 2917 clarifies that any accessory use a city or county may allow on designated agricultural lands of long-term significance must not interfere with and must support continuation of the overall agricultural use of the property and neighboring properties.
- S-6. **Family Day-Care Providers in Home** (RCW 36.70A.450 Amended, SB 5952) – No county or city may enact, enforce, or maintain an ordinance, development regulation, zoning regulation, or official control, policy, or administrative practice that prohibits the use of a residential dwelling, located in an area zoned for residential or commercial use, as a family day-care provider’s home facility.
- S-7. **Housing** (RCW 36.70A.070(2)) – Review and update housing inventory as part of the required Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Review new provisions governing affordable housing incentive programs that may be enacted or expanded in jurisdictions planning under the GMA. (RCW 36.70A.540, EHB 1464)
- S-8. **Forest Practices** (RCW 36.70A.570, SHB 1409) – Relating to the transfer of jurisdiction over conversion-related forest practices to local governments. For counties planning under the GMA, if more than 25 Class IV applications had been filed to the DNR between those dates for properties within a specific county, then that county, and the cities within it, are required to adopt forest practices approval ordinances.
- S-9. **Best Available Science** (RCW 36.70A.130(1)(c)) – The GMA was amended in 1995 to include the requirement that the county include the best available science (BAS) in developing policies and development regulations to protect the functions and values of critical areas. State law requires the county to consider the critical areas ordinance and best available science as part of this update.

Other items may be included in this list of requirements as time goes on. The list of projects should be updated as new statutory requirements are passed into law prior to completion of the periodic review.

## 2.2. Reconciliation Items

The items in this section were identified to be reconciled as part of the periodic review during 2009 Urban Growth Area review and revision.

- R-1. **Public Facility and Service Plan Consistency** (Policy 2C-5): A review of public facilities and services must be completed for the unincorporated UGAs – Birch Bay, Columbia

Valley, and Cherry Point – as part of the periodic review to ensure that plans are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The cities are expected to complete their own reviews as part of their respective growth management processes.

- R-2. **Subarea Plan Updates** (Policy 2L-2): The adopted subarea plans are of varying ages and applicability. Policy 2L-2 defines a process for revising these subarea plans. The timelines established for revision of subarea plans, however, may need to be reconsidered. Staff is currently limited and more time is needed to revise subarea plans.
- R-3. **Bellingham Population Allocation:** Bellingham has been asked to return as part of their required comprehensive plan and development regulation update in 2011 with a proposal for how they would accommodate a total of approximately 116,200 people, either through infill, changes in densities within the city and UGA, or expansion.
- R-4. **Bellingham UGA Land Use** (Policy 2T-12): Evaluate the feasibility of changing zoning from General Commercial to Light Impact Industrial in the Bellingham UGA in the vicinity of Interstate 5, north of the Bellingham International Airport.
- R-5. **County-wide Fire Protection Level of Service** (Policy 4H-3): Whatcom County has committed to establishing a level of service (LOS) standard for fire protection and suppression county-wide.
- R-6. **Agricultural Lands Mitigation, UGA Reserve:** UGA Reserves in Everson, Lynden, Nooksack, and Sumas included agricultural lands. The city and county are expected to work on strategies and plans to ensure protection of at least 100,000 acres of agricultural land in Whatcom County.
- R-7. **City UGA Implementation** (Goal 2Q): The County will work with the cities to establish interlocal agreements for interjurisdictional planning within the UGAs. The desired result of these agreements is more city control over development in their respective UGAs.

## 2.3. Docketed Amendment Requests

The items in this section were docketed amendment requests in 2010 or earlier. As these were items docketed by the County Council, Planning and Development Services is required to complete them in a timely fashion.

- D-1. **Agriculture Program** (Docket 2007-G, 2008-G): Consider transfer of development rights and other incentive-based agriculture protection methods.
- D-2. **Concurrency Management** (Docket 2007-F, 2008-M): Whatcom County adopted various school district capital facility plans and adopted a school impact fee ordinance. (See [Ordinance 2007-067](#)) The county has determined that it cannot implement development impact fees until the Growth Management Hearings Board issues an order finding compliance with the Growth Management Act.

- D-3. **Foothills Subarea Plan** (Docket 2007-C): Plan had been delayed awaiting UGA and LAMIRD decisions. Once both are finalized, the plan can move forward.
- D-4. **Birch Bay Subarea Plan – Fire LOS** (Docket 2007-0, 2008-I): Amend the Birch Bay Community Plan regarding fire protection facilities and level of service standards.
- D-5. **Parks Plan** (Docket 2007-E, 2008-E): Update the County Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan to comply with the requirements of the Growth Management Act.
- D-6. **Concrete Nor’West** (Docket 2009-F): Commercial forestry to mineral resource land near Saxon Road. Item held over for review due to pending SEPA issues.
- D-7. **Blaine UGA – Harbor Shores** (PLN 2010-00003): Reinstate portion of Blaine UGA south of Dakota Creek and west of Blaine Road for existing lots (Harbor Shores) and rezone the area to UR4. Proposal includes approximately 35 acres.
- D-8. **Agriculture to Rural – Gerard** (PLN 2010-00005): Amend land use designation from agricultural resource lands to rural. Also includes rezone request to R10A. Proposal includes approximately 60 acres.
- D-9. **Capital Facilities – 6-year CIP** (PLN 2010-00014): The proposal includes reviewing and updating the County’s Six-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP), Appendix F of the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan. Amendments to the Capital Facilities Chapter of the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan will also be considered, including: Review level of service standards; allowing a longer interval between updates of the six-year CIP; and adopting new or updated special purpose district plans by reference. Amendments to the Transportation Chapter of the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan relating to the ferry level of service may also be considered.
- D-10. **Rural Element Update** (RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)) - The county is under a Growth Management Hearings Board order to revise zoning designations that are not rural, and to revise the rural element of its comprehensive plan, showing the analysis used to arrive at the designation and mapping of limited areas of more intensive rural development (LAMIRDs).

## 2.4. Urban Growth Area Review Appeals

Upon completion of the Urban Growth Area (UGA) review and update process in 2009, a number of parties filed petitions for review with the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board. The County Council is currently reviewing these petitions and options to address concerns raised in those petitions. Should some additional public participation activities need to occur associated with one or more of these petitions, the Public Participation Plan will be reviewed and revised to include these activities.

## Chapter 3. Project Participants

The Public Participation Plan is designed to reach all audiences that may have an interest in the Comprehensive Plan Update process. It is also designed to reach out to other groups and individuals – those that may not yet have an interest or be inclined to participate – to encourage their awareness, understanding and involvement in the process. The PIP also promotes use of existing communication networks to encourage involvement in the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan Update process.

### 3.1. The Public

The general public is defined as members of the community including residents, groups, property owners, farmers, business owners and any others that might be interested in the Comprehensive Plan update process. The following sections contain a breakdown of some specific types of community groups and organizations that the County will attempt to engage in the Comprehensive Plan update process.

#### 3.1.1. Interested Property Owners and Developers

Interested property owners and developers are defined as members of the community that have an interest in growth and development regulations, especially as they relate to their private property rights. They may have an interest in developing or preserving their property. This might include farmers, real estate and development groups and other related professionals.

#### 3.1.2. Community Organizations

Community organizations are loosely defined as groups, associations, or committees that come together for a common interest or cause. This includes service groups, environmental groups, chambers of commerce, non-profit organizations, advocacy groups, community councils, neighborhood associations, local granges, social service organizations, religious organizations,

and others. Community organizations also include groups that are centered around non-city UGAs like the Birch Bay steering committee and others.

### 3.1.3. Other Groups and Individuals

WAC 365-196-900(4) states that “Each county or city should try to involve a broad cross-section of the community so groups not previously involved in planning become involved.” The County will continue to expand our email list to include as many residents as possible and as new groups come to the County’s attention, we will work to include them as appropriate.

## 3.2. Governmental/Quasi-Governmental Groups

Governmental and quasi-governmental groups are defined as organizations that have a connection to local government, including Whatcom Council of Governments; Whatcom County Council; City Councils; Whatcom County and individual cities’ Planning Commissions; area tribes; local special purpose districts; citizen advisory committees and others. Groups typically consist of elected officials, appointed or volunteer community members, or jurisdictional staff. Table 2.1 below shows a selected group of advisory committees that may be asked to comment on portions of amendments required to update the comprehensive plan. It will be important to ensure continued coordination with these groups throughout the entire Comprehensive Plan Update process.

**Table 2.1: Selected Whatcom County Advisory Boards/Committees and Commissions**

Agricultural Advisory Committee	Parks and Recreation Committee
Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee	Portage Bay Shellfish Protection District Advisory Committee
Birch Bay Shellfish Protection District Advisory Committee	Public Health Advisory Board
Birch Bay Watershed and Aquatic Resources Management Advisory Committee	Purchase of Development Rights Oversight Committee
Development Standards Technical Advisory Committee	Rural Library Board
Drayton Harbor Shellfish Protection District Advisory Committee	Surface Mining Advisory Committee <sup>2</sup>
Flood Control Zone District Advisory Committee	Whatcom County Community Network
Flood Control Sub-Zone District Advisory Committee	Whatcom County Housing Advisory Committee

<sup>2</sup> This advisory committee has been inactive. The committee will need additional appointments to form a complete committee before they will be able to actively engage in any projects in this program.

Lake Management District #1	Whatcom Council of Governments: Community Transportation Advisory Group
Marine Resource Committee	WRIA 1 – Joint Management Team

### 3.2.1. Planning Commission

Recently, the Washington State Department of Commerce issued revisions to the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). Implementation of the GMA as it relates to public participation is covered within WAC 365-196-600 “Public Participation.” WAC 365-196-600(3)(c) states: “The public participation program should clearly describe the role of the planning commission, ensuring consistency with requirements of chapter 36.70, 35.63, or 35A.63 RCW.”

For purposes of this process, the Planning Commission will be more involved in throughout each of the projects within the larger process. The Planning Commission is an appointed group of citizens that work directly with Planning and Development Services to craft legislation and make recommendations to the County Council. They also hear and make recommendations on applications for amendments to the Whatcom County Code and the Comprehensive Plan from private individuals, agencies and other applicants. Currently, the Planning Commission hears from the public primarily during public hearings and through written correspondence.

It is the goal that most town hall meetings, open houses and other public participation activities will occur with some involvement with the Planning Commission. In this way, the Planning Commission will hear straight from the public on each issue and will be more involved in crafting policies, earlier in the process. The public is encouraged to communicate with planning commissioners through the email and mailing address listed in Chapter 5 of this document in addition to attending planning commission meetings.

### 3.3. The Cities

Whatcom County will continue to engage with the Cities on issues that need to be reconciled as part of the 2011 periodic review. For example, the County will work with the cities on crafting new interlocal agreements to formalize discussions during the UGA review and revision. The Cities will be conducting their own periodic reviews as required by state law and any public participation regarding issues associated with their planning area will be an effort of each city.



## Chapter 4. Public Participation Approach

### 4.1. Overall Approach

The Washington state Administrative Code (WAC) provides guidelines and rules for public involvement in comprehensive planning. WAC 365-196-600 “Public Participation” states that “The public participation program should clearly describe the role of the planning commission, ensuring consistency with requirements of chapter 36.70, 35.63, or 35A.63 RCW.”

Through this public participation program the planning commission will act as the central hub for most public participation activities. In this way, the planning commission will have maximum exposure to the public perspective no matter how complex or minute the issue.

Starting in section 4.3, issues are broken down into 3 types for the purposes of public participation. Each type of issue has a different approach and the approach is described in each section. All the issues retain the numbers assigned to them in Chapter 2, so if more information is needed about an issue, the reader may refer back to Chapter 2.

### 4.2. Public Participation Information Sheet

It is the goal of this public participation plan that the public have maximum access to any process in which they are interested. Near the beginning of any process the project coordinator or public participation coordinator will complete a public participation information sheet (see Appendix A for example) which will be posted to the website along with any other relevant issue-related material. This information sheet will show what opportunities are available for public participation and will be updated as new opportunities are scheduled.

## 4.3. Level 1 Issues

Level 1 issues are generally less complicated and/or have already been through extensive public process.

### 4.3.1. Approach

These issues will travel through the process with the public process required by the code. Typically, the issue will follow this process.

- 1) **Proposal:** Staff generates a proposal.
- 2) **Proposal posted:** Proposal is posted to the website and announced through email list. Legal notice will be given as required and as appropriate. Public may make comment to the Planning Commission via email and/or US mail.
- 3) **Public hearing:** Planning Commission holds public hearing on issue.
- 4) **Work session and recommendation:** Planning Commission conducts work session on issue and recommends action to the County Council. Public may make comment to the County Council via email and/or US mail.
- 5) **County Council:** County Council will review the recommendation of the Planning Commission and hold a work session in committee. The Council will approve the recommendation, modify, or deny. If the Planning Commission recommendation is modified, another hearing will be held on that modification and then the Council will act.

### 4.3.2. Level 1 Issues

- S-2. **Multimodal Concurrency Amendments** (RCW 36.70A.108, 2SHB 1565)
- S-4. **Land for Facilities** (RCW 36.70A.110, .115, .210, SHB 1825)
- S-6. **Family Day-Care Providers in Home** (RCW 36.70A.450 Amended, SB 5952)
- S-8. **Forest Practices** (RCW 36.70A.570, SHB 1409)
- R-1. **Public Facility and Service Plan Consistency** (Policy 2C-5)
- R-7. **City UGA Implementation** (Goal 2Q)
- D-2. **Concurrency Management** (Docket 2007-F, 2008-M)
- D-6. **Concrete Nor'West** (Docket 2009-F) *Note: This item is quasi-judicial.*

## 4.4. Level 2 Issues

Level 2 issues require a little more than the code-required public process. The issues in this category are of a sensitive or political nature and/or the public has come out to oppose or support them in the past. They are generally more complicated.

### 4.4.1. Approach

These issues will travel through the process with advisory committee review in addition to the level of public process required by the code. Typically, the issue will follow this process.

- 1) **Alternatives:** Staff generates alternative approaches to the issue.
- 2) **Alternatives posted:** Alternatives are posted to the website and announced through email list. Legal notice will be given as required and as appropriate.
- 3) **Advisory Committee/Agency/City Review and Comment:** The alternatives will be submitted to the appropriate advisory committee, city or agency for review and comment. The proposed committee for review is listed next to each item in section 4.4.2.
- 4) **Proposal:** Staff generates a proposal considering any feedback received on the alternatives.
- 5) **Proposal posted:** Proposal is posted to the website and announced through email list and legal notice as required and as appropriate. Public may make comment to the Planning Commission via email and/or US mail.
- 6) **Public hearing:** Planning Commission holds public hearing on issue.
- 7) **Work session:** Planning Commission conducts work session on issue and recommends action to the County Council. Public may make comment to the County Council via email and/or US mail.
- 8) **County Council:** County Council will review the recommendation of the Planning Commission and hold a work session in committee. The Council will approve the recommendation, modify, or deny. If the Planning Commission recommendation is modified, another hearing will be held on that modification and then the Council will act.

### 4.4.2. Level 2 Issues

- S-1. **Physical Activity Amendments** (RCW 36.70A.070, SSB 5186)
- S-3. **Mineral Resource Lands** (RCW 36.70A.131)
- S-7. **Housing** (RCW 36.70A.070(2)) and (RCW 36.70A.540, EHB 1464)
- R-6. **Agricultural Lands Mitigation, UGA Reserve:** Coordination with Everson, Lynden, Nooksack, and Sumas, and the Agricultural Advisory Committee

- D-3. **Foothills Subarea Plan** (Docket 2007-C)
- D-4. **Birch Bay Subarea Plan – Fire LOS** (Docket 2007-0, 2008-I):
- D-7. **Blaine UGA – Harbor Shores** (PLN 2010-00003)
- D-8. **Agriculture to Rural – Gerard** (PLN 2010-00005): Agriculture Advisory Committee
- D-9. **Capital Facilities – 6-year CIP** (PLN 2010-00014): Coordination with service providers and County departments. Communication with isolated populations likely affected by area-specific issues, e.g. Lummi Island.
- D-10. **Rural Element Update** (RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d))

## 4.5. Level 3 Issues

These issues are generally more complicated and are of interest to the general public. All of these issues will have many opportunities for public comment, including a town-hall style meeting where they are able to openly share their feelings on the alternatives proposed or just the issue in general. When appropriate, town hall meetings will be planned close to areas that will be or are being impacted by the issue.

### 4.5.1. Approach

- 1) **Alternatives:** Staff generates alternative approaches to the issue.
- 2) **Alternatives posted:** Alternatives are posted to the website and announced through email list. Legal notice will be given as required and as appropriate.
- 3) **Advisory Committee Review/Agency Comment:** The alternatives will be submitted to the appropriate advisory committee for review and comment.
- 4) **Town hall meeting:** A town-hall style meeting is held to seek public input on the issue and the proposed alternatives. When appropriate, the meeting is held in a location that is reasonably located near an area affected by the issue. Planning Commission is in attendance at this town hall meeting.
- 5) **Proposal:** Staff generates a proposal with consideration for the feedback heard at the town hall meeting.
- 6) **Proposal posted:** Proposal is posted to the website and announced through email list. Legal notice will be given as required and as appropriate. Public may make comment to the Planning Commission via email and/or US mail.
- 7) **Public hearing:** Planning Commission holds public hearing on issue.
- 8) **Work session:** Planning Commission conducts work session on issue and recommends action to the County Council. Public may make comment to the County Council via email and/or US mail.

- 9) **County Council:** County Council will review the recommendation of the Planning Commission and hold a work session in committee. The Council will approve the recommendation, modify, or deny. If the Planning Commission recommendation is modified, another hearing will be held on that modification and then the Council will act.

#### 4.5.2. Level 3 Issues

- S-5. **Accessory Uses in Agricultural Lands** (RCW 36.70A.177, SHB 2917): Agriculture Advisory Committee
- S-9. **Best Available Science** (RCW 36.70A.130(1)(c)): A review committee will be reactivated for this effort, however, many of the existing advisory committees will make recommendations including the Agriculture Advisory Committee, Lake Whatcom Watershed Advisory Committee, Shellfish and Marine advisory committees and others who are impacted by Best Available Science.
- R-2. **Subarea Plan Updates** (Policy 2L-2): Activate subarea/community plan groups, if appropriate and in consideration of work plan priorities.
- R-3. **Bellingham Population Allocation**
- R-4. **Bellingham UGA Land Use** (Policy 2T-12)
- R-5. **County-wide Fire Protection Level of Service** (Policy 4H-3): Fire Chief's Association LOS sub-committee.
- D-1. **Agriculture Program** (Docket 2007-G, 2008-G): Agriculture Advisory Committee
- D-5. **Parks Plan** (Docket 2007-E, 2008-E): Parks and Recreation Committee, Parks and Recreation Department, Parks purveyors other than County Parks and Recreation.



## Chapter 5. Conclusion

This public participation plan was initially crafted at the beginning of the comprehensive planning process. It is a living document that should be updated as conditions change or new methods are discovered. This public participation plan meets the requirements of the RCW and the recently revised requirements of the WAC. Specifically, the department hopes that this public participation program will “involve a broad cross-section of the community, so groups not previously involved in planning become involved” as WAC 365-196-600(4) suggests it should.

To provide feedback on this public participation plan, please contact Kate Blystone at [kblyston@co.whatcom.wa.us](mailto:kblyston@co.whatcom.wa.us) or 360.676.6907. If you wish to provide comment on any issue to the Planning Commission or County Council, please utilize the following addresses:

Whatcom County Planning and Development Services  
5280 Northwest Drive  
Bellingham, WA 98226

Planning Commission  
c/o Becky Boxx, coordinator  
5280 Northwest Drive  
Bellingham, WA 98226  
[PDS\\_Planning\\_Commission@co.whatcom.wa.us](mailto:PDS_Planning_Commission@co.whatcom.wa.us)

County Council  
311 Grand Ave, Ste 105  
Bellingham, WA 98225  
[council@co.whatcom.wa.us](mailto:council@co.whatcom.wa.us)



# Appendix A

*Sample Public Participation Information Sheet*

# Appendix B

*Public Comment/Response*