

Foothills Subarea Plan Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
Saturday, September 8, 2007

Committee members in attendance:

Richard Banel
Jan Eskola
Amy Mower
Cindy Purdy

Phil Cloward, Vice Chair
Gary Gehling, Chair
Lou Piotrowski
Sean Wilson

Determination of Quorum

Gary Gehling called the meeting to order; a determination of a quorum was made.

Comments by Bill Grimes of Studio Cascade relating to the preliminary draft Foothills Subarea Plan (August 2007 version)

I understand you had a meeting on Wednesday and had a chance to talk about the plan and there might be things that I'm about to say that are duplicative of what you may have already discussed before but I just want to go through a small list of things here in introductory comments.

I want to start off first with some caveats about the document that you've been delivered. I want to reaffirm that this is indeed a draft document. This is something that will need to go through another editing session just to make sure it's a much more readable and much more attractive document for public consumption.

Early on we were talking about the policy matrix and why we wanted to have it. As we prepare a document you write it chapter-by-chapter, the policy matrix is something to make sure we have some level of consistency from one chapter to the next and as you read this document you see the chapters are somewhat redundant. The structure of the chapters from one to the next really is so similar that as we are producing them we wind up restating some things, so as we go through the document from front to back editing we'll see it becoming much more streamlined much more readable.

Also, we will be inserting graphics and photos so if you happen to have photographs that you've taken of the Foothills subarea that you think are representative of some of the things that should have a graphical voice in the plan, please feel free to submit them to me or Matt and we'll include them in the document as appropriate and give credit for that as well.

We want this not only to be a good tight policy document, but we also want it to be a readable and attractive document. Any kind of imagery to help communicate what the Foothills Plan is getting at we'll be happy to take a look at and see if we can include it.

The structure of this plan; the table-of-contents were dictated to us by the existing comprehensive plan to a large extent and also by our scope of work in the contract.

When you take a look at the chapters you will see a lot of similarity; you'll see introductory text that gives setting and purpose for the chapter. In some cases it includes quite a lot of technical background about what's going on. In other cases it's a

little bit more qualitative but still it's designed to give the person who may be unfamiliar with the Foothills an adequate shot of what's going on in the Foothills today. Then it introduces some of the issues that really drive this planning process and then it goes into a statement of future demand, future expected state, and planning concepts. We are able to translate what we see as issues into a conceptual direction for the Plan to implement. Then we get into the Goals and Policies which, as you will see, are drawn from that policy matrix that we spent some time with this spring. Those Goals and Policies include, in many cases, work that was done by the two subcommittees and the group who put together some economic development language.

What is different about this Plan that you don't see in the County Comprehensive Plan are a chapter on the Columbia Valley Urban Growth Area, a chapter on the Kendall Small Town master plan, Public Participation chapter and also an Implementation chapter that is drawing from the committee's earlier work to identify specific projects and relative priorities.

A little bit about the subcommittee work. You gave us a lot of information and said incorporate this as best you can using your professional judgment. We've attempted to do that. A group of you worked on reviewing the existing comprehensive plan policies to see which ones relate to the Foothills either directly or indirectly and how we might be able to incorporate something related to those in the Subarea Plan. We went through that work and we consolidated like policies and dug through the nuance of the different policies and added ones that we felt most appropriate in here. We did the same with the subcommittee's report on the previous Subarea Plan. This was a lot of information that we were able to pull in and add to our policy matrix. We also used a lot of that information to inform our text; to introduce the issues and concepts. You can identify which ones are added to the policy matrix because the font size changes; the subcommittee ones are bigger. That should be an easy guide to figure out what was added from the subcommittee work. And again, also the economic work that was done.

Some of the stuff about the Economic policies; we tried to take them back a step so that they would be a little bit more big picture and in tune with what we have as an Economic chapter of the Subarea Plan. There is a lot of good work in that report that did not get translated into this directly and I think that what it really speaks too is the need for a broader economic development strategy that wasn't necessarily a part of the Subarea Plan scope. It makes sense that it is not necessarily to be part of the Subarea Plan scope because it really does involve a different type of strategic thinking about how to prioritize improvements, how to direct it and what you really want to target for economic development and economic sustainability in the Foothills Subarea. Good stuff. I would certainly encourage the group and the County to keep that in mind. I think we've maybe even identified an Economic Development strategy as an implementation program in the Subarea Plan. If you're really wanting to incorporate policies like those, do some of the work that you'll need to do to support them and prioritize some of your economic development efforts and energies in that direction.

I imagine that as we talk today we'll have an opportunity to discuss some of these other items and I want to make sure that we take the time to discuss those four chapters that really are new to you; which are the Columbia Valley UGA, the Kendall Small Town, the Public Participation, and the Implementation. Gary, if you are thinking about pace in going through these things I want to make sure we really do have an opportunity to get at the four chapters which really are new.

In some of the chapters, particularly the Columbia Valley UGA chapter, there are several cross references. We talked about the Columbia Valley UGA in the Land Use chapter, the Transportation chapter, the Housing chapter, the Economic chapter. We didn't want to restate those policies individually in the Columbia Valley UGA chapter so what we have is a cross reference matrix that says "Hey these are the Goals and Policies that relate to the Columbia Valley UGA that you'll find elsewhere in the Plan". We just want to make sure we have some kind of cross reference in the Columbia Valley UGA. So if the Columbia Valley UGA chapter is where someone needs to go, they can see where they can find other related goals and policies in relation to Columbia Valley.

That's it for my introductory comments. I would like to restate that this document is going to be a very good looking and a very readable document when it comes out the other side.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Order of business:

Today's meeting and a September 19, 2007 meeting will be followed by the issuance of a revised draft plan including changes presented at these meetings. Hopefully the draft plan can be issued by the end of September followed by a draft plan rollout on Monday, October 15, 2007 and one last meeting on Wednesday, October 17, 2007, where any public input received can be considered by this committee and incorporated.

Bill is developing the plan for the October 15 rollout meeting which may include a formal hour presentation and an hour Q & A session. The committee discussed how to make the priorities for what is going to be covered in the rollout session.

It was suggested that a summary be prepared to circulate. A draft summary will be prepared and format delivery will be coordinated by Bill and Matt. This summary should cause the newspaper to prepare a story that would generate interest. The Foothills Gazette, Whatcom Independent, and Cascadia Weekly should be included in the distribution. It should be noted that the document will be available on the Whatcom County website. The summary could also be available at the post office and the library (draft plan is available at the library).

Prioritize the focus to some degree on the change and the need to emphasize the Columbia Valley UGA and emphasize how the Plan has addressed maintaining rural character.

Anchor the presentation in the June vision week discussion which breaks out the concerns and then formulate the planning concept. Work from the general thoughts about vision that people were adamant about during the four meetings and then show how this plan actually gets there. Each topic area will be looking from the macro to the micro. Talk about the things that were expressed as important then show how it gets implemented in the plan.

These protocols for the meeting were discussed including what the process is from that point forward so as people are leaving the building they'll take that extra bit of information. It was noted that public comment was important because that's what's going to make the plan implementable.

Review Preliminary Draft Foothills Subarea Plan (Aug. 2007 version)

Page 29 (Planning Context) Jan asked that the last sentence in the 3rd paragraph, page 29 be deleted (*The district has gone through bankruptcy because of the need to carry the capital debt and operating costs of a system that is under-utilized*). She stated that it's been so long that it's no longer applicable. The district has already gone through that process and everything is o.k. now. The part of the sentence that bothered her was in reference to the bankruptcy. **After some discussion the committee decided to leave the sentence in the Plan.**

Page 5 (Table of Contents, Chapter 2) delete: "~~Foothills Subarea Plan Goals and Policies~~", pg. 48, (it is stated twice).

Pages 11, 13 & 14 (Population) Census District 101 population figures were discussed and the differing population figures reviewed. The Foothills is only a part of Census District 101. In the first draft District 101 had 6410 people and is not mentioned in current draft. Also Foothills population in the first draft was 5021 and now is 5409. How was this difference determined? And lastly, given that the Census District is not broken out with the Foothills, how the determination was made as to what the population was in the Foothills? Draft may not have reflected committee work, utility records, etc. **Bill will check with ECONorthwest regarding amplifying the population estimates.**

Page 13 (Population) discussion regarding: "According to the 2000 Census, in the Peaceful Valley Census Designated Place (which includes much of the Urban Growth Area), 22.2 percent of the population was of Russian ancestry and 4.9 percent was of Ukrainian ancestry." **A discussion determined that a census boundary of a certain area doesn't necessarily match the boundary of the subdivision and that Paradise would be part of the Peaceful Valley Census.**

Page 76 & 77 (Utilities-Existing Connections, Table 5.1) discussion regarding connections resulted in the following added language: Table 5.1 – Additional Waterwater connections to serve the UGA.

Page 33 (Land Use Planning Issues) discussion regarding: "*Suburban, single-family style development, like that in Columbia Valley, is not at all consistent with the view of development Foothills residents have for the rest of the subarea.*" Committee was concerned that other areas such as Snowline that exist are grandfathered in. The differing density of single-family development is important. The proliferation of large-lot single-family subdivisions is not going to be consistent with the desire to preserve rural character in the Foothills Subarea. **Bill will wordsmith and circulate new language regarding the density issue through the subarea.**

Page 17 (Foothills Subarea Plan, Table 1.6) Table 1.6 regarding the ECONorthwest assumption column actually being the committee adoption assumption. ECONorthwest had recommended baseline population in their report. Is it appropriate to mention that here? Staff noted that the committee had a differing opinion as a whole and that this is available in the background documentation. It was also suggested that the ECONorthwest prominence be reduced in the document and make it more of a locally owned, locally feed chapter to reduce detraction from the committee's work. It was also

suggested that both tables appear on the same page for ease of comparison. The growth assumption was actually made by the subcommittee and added by vote and that may be used for more information than the heading. Table 1.5 needs to remain as it is. The heading of Table 1.6 was changed to Foothills Subarea Plan Adopted Population Forecast. The heading on the 4th column was changed to ECONorthwest Growth Assumption recommended by the FSPAC.

Page 67 (Foothills Subarea Plan Goals and Policies - Goal H5) Discussion on whether no shooting zone was for UGA and small towns. It was noted that there are two policies, one for each. **It was suggested that Bill wordsmith as appropriate.** Have a policy that relates to safe housing. It was also noted that we have some wording, no shooting zone in small towns not intending to interfere with existing businesses and that what we are assuming is that the County Council would take that up and put it in consistency with the existing no shooting zones. **The issue was put off until it is known what the County Code is and then it will be further discussed.**

Page 58 (Existing Conditions) add to the following sentence: In data gathered with a questionnaire during the public participation process of developing this plan, respondents frequently said they wanted additional law enforcement and their communities cleaned up.

Page 60 (Housing Issues) under median household income for Glacier, delete 10,875 and replace with 34,000 and attach a footnote referencing the census figure of \$10,875 and indicating that: The low median income is likely due to the lack of participation in the 2000 census. The actual median income adopted by the Foothills Subarea Plan Committee is \$34,000.

This note will also reflect over into the monthly housing expense change, 34,000 divided by 12 and multiplied by 30%.

Page 61 (Housing Issues) delete in the following sentence: Housing in Deming is in short supply, but the areas to the immediate west of the high school may offer opportunities for additional housing development.

Page 63 (Seasonal Dwelling Units) discussion regarding a significant number of recreational vehicles in the area including Black Mountain Ranch, The Glen, and Camper's Paradise. Committee added: Although they are not considered dwelling units, there are a significant number of recreational units in Black Mountain Ranch, Camper's Paradise, and The Glen at Maple Falls.

Page 67 Chapter 3 (Housing) An informational map will be insertion prior to the policy matrix or at the end of Chapter 3 showing parcels with dwelling units. It was suggested that a map index be added or that the maps all appear at the end.

Page 3 (Foothills Subarea Plan Advisory Committee) amend: Columbia Valley UGA/Kendall in three locations to make it known that these representatives were still representing the Kendall area.

Page 71 (Future Needs) change: "but an increasing urban population in the Columbia Valley may demand will require an increased law enforcement presence.

Page 76 (Utilities) wording - septic system versus systems, was discussed but no changes made.

Page 46 (Land for Public Purposes) change as follows: Maple Falls hosts the Maple Falls library, and Through an agreement with the Cemetery District, a Whatcom County

Library System branch library is currently located in Maple Falls. There are plans to re-locate this library to Kendall.

Page 70 (Future Needs) delete: Library facilities at Maple Falls and Deming now perform multiple civic tasks, requiring double use of library space for activities that would be well served by a regional resource center. The need for such a facility is not debated among the community, but the location for one is. Some supporters of the resource center concept favored a site in Kendall, but a

Page 127 (Community Facilities, Schools,) add: Library service for the Foothills population is provided by the Whatcom County Library System through its branches and bookmobile. As of 2007, there are branches located in Maple Falls and Deming. The two libraries are part of the Whatcom County Rural Library District, a special countywide taxing district. All permanent Whatcom County residents have borrowing privileges as long as they possess either a county or City of Bellingham library card.

The growth of the region and the recognition of the role of the public library as a community center and as the place for ongoing and lifelong learning have necessitated local efforts to expand and/or re-locate library facilities. Changing demographics, including an immigrant population, also contribute to this need. The Deming Friends of the Library have nearly completed an addition to their facility, and there are plans to re-locate the Maple Falls Library to a new, central location in Kendall, thanks to the efforts of the Friends of the North Fork Community Library.

Additionally, the language should be amended to state: As of 2007, there are plans to relocate the Maple Falls library to Kendall.

Page 71(Future Needs) amend to state: A six-acre site two miles up Kendall Road in the heart of the Columbia Valley was approved by the County Council and donated to the County in 2006

Page 161 (Columbia Valley Urban Growth Area-Industrial Uses) The net acreage of the UGA will not be increased because of the re-designation of Potential Planned Light Impact Industrial to Planned Light Impact Industrial.

Page 160 (Greenbelts and Open Space) amend: but the County may wish will need to revise its parks plan . . .

Pages 163 and 164 (Stormwater Collection) note: **Bill will revise to incorporate LID priority – Phil also indicated that water goes to ground – infiltrates.**

Page 176 (Columbia Valley UGA and Adjacent Lands map) Note: Matt will come back with maps showing a planned residential overlay and an associated policy indicating as planned residential county supports rezoning to UR4. **This will be a future agenda item.**

Page 189 (Kendall Master Plan Concept) add note that the boundaries of the Kendall Small Town Commercial zone may have to be altered in response to the decision by the Court of Appeals.

Page 175 (Vision Assessment – Table 13.1) Note: Committee wanted these sorted to parallel design objectives (i.e. in priority).

Page 180 (Figure 13.2) Note: Committee wanted Studio Cascade to show all (or a variety) of the design concepts.

Page 190 (Policy References) Note: Committee wanted one column instead of two.

Public Comment – Second Period

Daniel Cohen stated that he still had some anxiety regarding the plan and preserving the rural character of the area. It doesn't really explain how adding the developments and populations is not going to be in direct conflict with what it said during vision week regarding people's strong desire to retain the rural character. I know this has been said before but I just wanted to say it one more time as the process comes to an end. How is it going to be paid for? We don't want it or are we going to have to pay for it? How is the traffic going to impact? What is going to happen? When he spoke with others they said they were going to move. I know you have heard it before. Maybe it is going to retain the rural character, I don't know, but that should be explained.

Kevin Zender asked about the overlay. Was there some language in the draft plan that talked about the hillside. You might want to look at the far southeast 20 not putting the overlay because part of it goes up really steep.

Staff noted that this was in the rural zone and clarified the overlay.

Jack Hovenier asked about the library. It may not be in the right place. Jack and Phil wanted to put in that the County Council voted to put the library in the Columbia Valley but that they did that without public comment.

Staff noted that they did not vote to put the library up there but they voted to put the community center.

Jack followed that he was just saying that they did that without public comment. They did not come to the meeting that they advised them to. They did not show up. Pete Kremen and Dewey Desler showed up but the County Council did not show up.

Typo corrections

Page 160: and can be ~~rezone~~rezoned to Light Impact

Page 186: The ~~Kendal~~Kendall school is a prominent

Page 194 (Policies) Note: Committee wanted one column, rather than two columns.

Page 198 (Table 15.2 Implementation Projects) additional to fourth column, line 3 Kendall. Community Facilities, Recreation and Capital Facilities.

Page 197 Add # 19: Area: Columbia Valley UGA, Description: Park, Chapters: Capital Facilities, Recreation and Columbia Valley UGA

Page 201 (Implementation Tasks) add as first bullet: Review and, as necessary, revise comprehensive plan and zoning designations in Deming, Welcome, Kendall, Maple Falls and Glacier to comply with the "limited areas of more intensive rural development" criteria of RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d). The review and revisions will be completed prior to the compliance deadline set by the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board.

Page 200 (Table 15.2-Implementation Projects) add: # 40: Area: Columbia Valley UGA, Description: Park, Chapters: Capital Facilities, Recreation and Columbia Valley UGA

Page 201(Implementation Tasks) amend, per 5-3 vote, the following: Amend the zoning code to prohibit clustering in ~~Rural and~~ Rural Forestry zones ~~except in the Agriculture Protection Overlay District~~

Page 201 (Implementation Task) discussion regarding: “. . . footprint to 2,000 square feet in Glacier, Maple Falls, and Kendall and 2,500 square feet in Deming.” **Suggestion – add to agenda for 9/19/07.**

Page 77 (Utilities) Matt has contacted Kelly Winn of Evergreen Water & Sewer District in order to accurately correlate figures in Chapter 5 to Chapter 12 – Columbia Valley UGA water service. Matt expects to have those figures next week.

Page 88 (Freight Movement) FSPAC wanted Studio Cascade to add things coming into the Subarea such as: wholesale goods, deliveries to restaurants, stores, etc.

Page 88 (Public Transportation) amend: (with limited ~~hours and runs~~ service on Saturdays).

Page 88 (Level-of-Service Standards) NOTE: Add an explanation of why this is relevant (why LOS is important).

Page 79 (Television, Phone and Cellular Services) NOTE: With regard to the sentence starting with “Only one cellular tower exists. . . “ The FSPAC wasn’t aware of any such tower – and they wanted you to double check this – they said there is a Nextel tower up by the ski area.

Page 85 – 87 (Transportation – Maps) Committee would like to see a map that shows an area map beyond the foothills plus the entire foothills road system and the different categories and grades as well as accident information. See note for page 97.

Page 97 (Foothills Subarea Plan Goals and Policies Goal T11) NOTE: Add the following maps: Road Functional Class, Transit Route, WSDOT “Foothills SubArea Projects”

Page 98(Economics) amend: Natural resources ~~extraction~~ utilization has been . . . Government sector (which includes Tribal employment) and many . . . western Whatcom County or Sumas to work.

Page 101(Employment Trends) amend: Foothills ~~hashave~~ a disproportionately large amount of covered . . .Mount Baker School District, ~~Shuttle~~ Contemporary Design Company (an exercise . . .

(Employment Forecast) add background information as appendix (see addition to page 202) and keep these documents on file at Planning and Development Services.

Page 102 (Table 7.2 – Taxes Collected from Taxable Retail Sales) The FSPAC wanted either gross receipts or a footnote that Tribal and wholesale operations, which don’t pay retail sales tax, could significantly add to economic activity. Bill will talk to ECONorthwest about sectors that don’t report.

Page 105 (Strengths and Weaknesses) add: The County’s adopted forecast for the subarea projects a 2.36 percent . . .

Page 107 (Employment Forecast) NOTE: List examples of business incubators

Page 110 (Foothills Subarea Plan Goals and Policies) delete the following: ~~EG2-D-- Protect Planned Light Impact Industrial lands from conversion to other uses that are not~~

~~consistent with the Columbia Valley UGA job creation objectives.~~—And – reletter E, F, and G to EC2-~~DE~~, EC2-~~EF~~, and EC2-~~FG~~.

Page 111 – 112 (Foothills Subarea Plan Goals and Policies) for **ED3-A** add: Port of Bellingham, Mount Baker Foothills Chamber of Commerce, Glacier Chamber of Commerce, Mount Baker Foothills Economic Development . . . for **EC4-K** add: Work with the ~~local~~ Mount Baker Foothills Chamber of Commerce, Glacier Chamber of Commerce, Mount Baker Foothills Economic Development Association, for **EC4-Q** add s to chamber: Cooperate with the ~~Chamber~~Chambers

Page 113 (Foothills Subarea Plan Goals and Policies) for **EC6-A** add: Make safety and crime prevention in business districts and through-out the subarea a priority.

Page 114 (Resource Lands) add: and the goals and policies in the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan and Foothills Subarea Plan ~~comprehensive plan~~ reinforce.

Page 120 (Recreation-Parks and Trails) add: Maple Falls and Glacier. Additionally, some portions of the rail-road bed are no longer in existence because of Nooksack River erosion. The Silver Lake Trail . . .

Page 126 (Community Facilities-Library) add: The libraries provide public access to the Internet as well as many other services such as children’s story hour and teen reading events. The relocation of the Maple Falls library to a new central location in Kendall supports these services.

Page 128 (Community Facilities-Standards of Adequacy) add: As of fall 2007, The Whatcom County Library System is in the process the Friends of the North Fork Library are in the preliminary stages of planning to build . . . add: ~~They are also~~ The Whatcom County Library System is in the process . . .

Page 128 (Community Facilities-Standards of Adequacy) add: The Friends of the Deming Library ~~is being expanded~~ are expanding the Deming Library in 2007-08

Page 127 (Community Facilities – Existing Facilities) after Standards of Adequacy and Proposed Facilities: Bill, will add the missing information on schools, fire protection and emergency medical services.

Page 132 (Community Facilities Map) add location reference: Kendall Library.

Page 133 (Environment) correct: The forests are also populated with deer, bear, elk, moose, and various other large . . . and add: The dense forests of the subarea are primarily composed of evergreen and deciduous tree species and shrubs

Page 134 (Environment-North Fork Basin) correct: It drains a 293 square mile ~~areas-~~area with an annual runoff . . .

Page 135 (Environment-Sumas River and Upper Fraser River Basin) NOTE: In the Sumas River, there are all native fish – it is not stocked.

(Environment Chapter) General comments by advisory committee: add reference to Nooksack Salmon Enhancement Association (NESA), Lummi Nation and Nooksack Tribe stream restoration projects. Add reference to Forests and Fish Law passed by the State legislature in 1999 to address salmon recovery.

Page 137 (Environment-Issues) added-and cross reference with transportation chapter: The creek floods frequently. As of fall 2007, the Boulder Creek bridge is being replaced.

Page 140 (Environment-Habitat Forest Habitat) add: **Amphibians and Reptiles:** newts, salamanders, western toads, [rubber boa](#) and Pacific treefrogs

Page 141 (Environment-Habitat Fresh Aquatic) add: **Fish:** pink, Chinook, coho, chum and [riverine](#) sockeye salmon, searun cutthroat trout

Page 144 (Environment-Foothills Subarea Plan Goals and Policies EN1-G) discussion regarding “densities consistent with WCC 24.05” resolved to member satisfaction.

Page 144 (Environment Policy EN1-H) add: Recognize [and protect](#) natural wetlands such as swamps . . .

Page 202 (Implementation Tasks) add bibliography as an appendix.

Public Comment:

Speaker not identified and mostly inaudible.

Jack Hovenier We have earlier discussed what I thought might be largely a housekeeping issue. It wasn't our intent to throw out anything this late. But when we initially brought up our concern about rezoning, the section still being marked RF in the UGA, Matt mentioned that there might be some concerns with the County being the proponent to have the underlying zoning changed. It was not our intent to do that. As some of you know, we actually are trying to get some of that rezoned but, from my prospective, it is the committee's role to look at the long term. We didn't ask, for example, that it be UR4. However, when I saw the final map, when all of us that own property saw the final map, we thought, even though if you read the whole document you can make it pretty clear that it was the intent that those portions of the UGA that we own on the east side were to be part of the residential long-term available land. That point can be missed unless it is marked on the map. We can make the link by going back to the document showing the population, showing the acreage. But we wanted to be clear on the map so that people who didn't really sift through the document would readily understand. We think that it is everybody's intent that it be residential since, what was a majority of the committee, voted against having that be light industrial. That leaves basically residential, we weren't asking for commercial. We really weren't even necessarily asking for light industrial but it seemed that after it was all said and done that Mr. Hovenier's take of the committee's recommendation of that be residential and I think that's most of your prospective as well.

We do accept Matt's suggestion today that the 40 acres that you propose be added to the UGA be left RF because, originally when you recommended that it be R10A that was to resolve a discrepancy in the Comprehensive Plan. So, instead of having Matt bring two alternatives, we are fine with it just being one and that would be the one that leaves it RF, that is what it currently is, but with an overlay indicating that the long-term plan is for this to be residential development. The only reason that we are asking for this, again to reiterate, we want to make sure that future people understand the committee's intent. I think we are actually trying to articulate something that I thought was pretty clear. That's really it. This is the third time that we have brought it up. I apologize to keep bringing it up but we are kind of nearing the end and I'm afraid that if we don't bring it up that it is possible it will get missed and thanks for all your hard work. Thanks.

Matt noted that he would only bring one alternative next time.

Page 147 (Environment – Fish Habitat Conservation Areas Map) – [add reference language footnote to the map describing source of information \(WDFW, etc.\)](#)

Adjourned

Penny V. Harrison, Planning & Development Services