

**Foothills Subarea Plan Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary- June 27, 2007**

Committee members in attendance:

Richard Banel	Gary Gehling, Chair
Jan Eskola	Lou Piotrowski
Alan Seid	Sean Wilson
Cindy Purdy	Norma Otto
Phil Cloward, Vice Chair	Bill Coleman
Amy Mower	

Determination of Quorum.

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

Public Comment – First Period.

No public comment.

Advisory committee review and approval of June 7 and June 20, 2007 meeting summaries.

June 7, 2007 meeting summary was approved.

June 20, 2007 meeting summary:

- Jan commented that June 20, 2007 minutes were correct but that the accusations in the minutes were incorrect. Jan stated that she wanted everyone to be aware that she did not send anything to Bill Grimes.
- Sean said that was not his assertion although many perceived it that way. The words he used were - put into the public record, which will be forwarded to Bill at some point for inclusion into the draft plan. He felt that it left them all at a disadvantage in the sense that if we were to respond with our comments as well after agreeing not to do that we could potentially violate the open public meetings act and not only that because none of us were going to move on that because we had agreed not to. Sean said his point was not that Jan had sent the comments to Bill but that they were included in the public record and would be reviewed by the consultant when he goes to put the draft plan together.
- Jan said that she disagreed with Sean because her comments were sent to the committee and they had not been discussed whatsoever.
- Amy stated that in the June 20th minutes over half of the content concerned the process question. There is more summary and conclusive treatment of the various issues on light industrial and she asked that the light industrial portion be expanded to include detail in that area.
- Matt asked that Pam go back and expand the section of the meeting summary in which the light industrial issues were discussed. The meeting summary will then be approved at the September meeting.

Matt then introduced Mia Akau to the committee. She will begin attending Foothill Subarea Advisory Committee meetings in September 2007 in place of Pam.

Consideration of potential goals & policies from Studio Cascade's "Foothills Subarea Plan Policy Choices Matrix," the industrial build-out policy, and the planned industrial overlay & potential planned industrial overlay map designations.

- Sean said that in reference to the 80-acre parcel that is already in the UGA (north of Limestone Road), he spoke with the property owners briefly and the property owners expressed an interest in having the 80 acres in the UGA and having the industrial overlay applied. They said that proposals would be reviewed as they came along; he understood that no viable proposals had been submitted that would be appropriate for that area. Sean said that the representative of the property owner is David Granger and he seemed very responsive.
- The committee spent time discussing parcels that may be appropriate to be included in the industrial overlay. They looked at parcels north and east of the UGA as directed in the proposed policy text, the R5A parcels and the MRL parcels were considered and it was discussed whether the industrial overlay should be applied only to contiguous parcels.
- Matt gave the committee some information relating to industrial land in Everson and Nooksack. Everson has a population of approximately 2,100 people. They have 131 acres of land zoned industrial, 60 of which is undeveloped. Nooksack has a population of approximately 1,000 people and they have 13 acres zoned industrial with 3 acres undeveloped. In comparison, the Columbia Valley's 2006 population was approximately 3,800 people.
- Matt summarized Studio Cascades' Draft Policy: (1) if the original 40-acre industrial land designation is built out, then 40 more acres can be designated. (2) If a property owner denies access then you could swap the original 40 acres for a different 40 acres of planned industrial.
- Policy Matrix, page 1 (Land Use) Whatcom County has adopted an approximately 40-acre planned light impact industrial designation within the Columbia Valley UGA as shown on map??. The County may designate another 40-acres of land for UGA/light impact industrial development within the boundaries of the potential planned light impact industrial designation only if the initial 40 acres in the planned light impact industrial designation is either substantially put to use for industrial purposes or is removed from the UGA/planned light impact industrial designation by amending the Foothills Subarea Plan and the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan. In any case, the County's intent is to meter the amount of land available for light impact industrial uses to match demand and to avoid designating more land than necessary for light impact industrial development. **Approved by consensus of the committee.**
- The committee came up with five industrial overlay options:
 - Option A: 160 acres + 40 acres (on the east) = 200 acres 3 straw votes
 - Option B: 160 acres (north of Limestone Rd) = 160 acres 6 straw votes
 - Option C: Original 80 original acres = 80 acres 3 straw votes
 - Option D: Original 80 acres + 40 acres (on the east) = 120 acres 1 straw vote

- Option E: Original 80 acres + 40 acres (R10) = 120 acres 4 straw votes
 - The two industrial overlay options that had the most votes were Option B and Option E. Lou and Norma voiced concern about Option E because of the potential traffic problems in residential areas. Norma said that the condition of the road was already problematic.
 - The committee chose to vote on Option B industrial overlay - 160 acres (north of Limestone Rd). This option contained about 40 acres of Planned Light Impact Industrial in the UGA north of Limestone Rd. It also included approximately 120 acres of Potential Planned Light Impact Industrial located generally north of Limestone Rd.
- Approved by 7-3-1 committee vote.** (Phil, Gary, Sean, Richard, Bill, Norma and Lou voted to approve Option B. Amy, Jan and Cindy were opposed. Alan abstained).
- Policy Matrix, page 1 (Land Use) Recognize the need for light impact industrial land uses within and/or bordering on the Columbia Valley Urban Growth Area. Consider establishing a light impact industrial zone ~~within the long term planning area~~ located on the north side of Limestone Road as shown on the Planned Light Impact Industrial and Potential Planned Light Impact Industrial map. Retain the existing zoning ~~within this long term planning area until a master plan has been completed to identify~~ traffic impacts and infrastructure/utility/service needs, and appropriate mitigation measures have been identified. Consider modifying the Columbia Valley UGA boundary in appropriate locations north and west of the existing UGA to allow for the allocation of only light impact industrial land in sufficient acreage to attract and maintain business opportunities. Ensure the UGA is not expanded in acreage as a result of the modification. Assure an adequate supply of light impact industrial sites to meet future market demands for light impact industrial development. **Approved by 8-3 committee vote.** (Phil, Gary, Sean, Richard, Bill, Norma, Lou, and Alan voted to approve the policy. Amy, Jan and Cindy were opposed).
 - Policy Matrix, page 8 (Land Use) Encourage development of light impact industrial or business park land uses in the Columbia Valley UGA in areas planned for light impact industrial uses. **Approved by consensus of the committee.**
 - Policy Matrix, page 8 (Housing) ~~Match residential zoning in the Foothills to provide for the range and type of housing consistent with a Subarea economic development strategy.~~ **Policy deleted by consensus of the committee.**

Consideration of potential goals & policies for the Subarea Plan that were submitted by individual committee members.

- Richard said that he doesn't feel the committee should spend any more time looking at his Draft Light Industrial and Economic Policy. He would like to forward it on the Bill Grimes and let him work on it.
- Alan suggested the following suggestions:
 - Delete policy 8 LD
 - Delete policy 20 LD
 - 7 M - Work with the real estate community, state and local economic development agencies and other partners to attract new business and industry to

the Columbia Valley, only when those businesses are aligned with the Foothills Subarea Plan vision.

Alan's 3 suggestions were adopted by consensus of the committee.

- After considering Alan's suggestions the committee decided by consensus to forward the Draft Proposed Foothills Subarea Light Industrial and Economic Policy (proposed by Richard Banel) to Bill Grimes. The committee agreed to allow Bill to apply his judgment in incorporating the language into the Subarea Plan and he may modify the wording as necessary. The committee also asked Bill to use the term "light impact" industrial instead of industrial or manufacturing in the document. He is also being asked to determine which policies apply to the UGA and which policies apply to the Subarea as a whole.
- Matt suggested that the committee consider whether or not they want to language that addresses design guidelines in Banel's proposed policies. The committee agreed by consensus to delete proposed policy 6 LD and 14 LD.
- After discussion the committee also agreed by consensus to delete proposed policy 1 F.
- Amy suggested that the committee also direct Bill Grimes to keep rural character in mind when considering policies outside the UGA.
- Sean read aloud the "Mount Baker Foothills Sub-Area Plan Update 2007 Economic Development and Diversification – Policy Submittal(s)" to the committee and the members of the public.
- The committee discussed the zoning designations that the proposal will affect, 20.44 and 20.36 and what uses are currently permitted.
- The committee also noted that the numbers used in the proposal are arbitrary. Sean suggested taking the numbers out and leaving blanks where Bill can insert appropriate numbers.
- The committee decided, by consensus, to forward the "Mount Baker Foothills Sub-Area Plan Update 2007 Economic Development and Diversification – Policy Submittal(s)" to consultant Studio Cascade for incorporation into the draft Subarea Plan to the extent that it can be under the contract between Whatcom County and Studio Cascade. This proposal includes new Rural Recreational and Open Space zoning provisions that would allow additional uses in rural areas. The committee recognized that this proposal may be outside of the scope of the contract and may have to be inserted in the Subarea Plan as an implementation item that would be completed after the Subarea Plan is adopted.

Report from subcommittee reviewing the 1988 Foothills Subarea Plan.

Jan reported that the subcommittee met yesterday. They reviewed Matt's comments and will forward their report to Bill Grimes.

Strategy/timeframe for completing Advisory Committee review of the Subarea Plan.

- The committee will not meet in July or August. Bill Grimes will be working on the draft Subarea Plan and will submit it to the committee in August. Individuals on the committee will thoroughly read and review the draft plan and come in September with

specific items or comments. The committee will not review the draft line by line. There will be 3 committee meetings in September. Then we will have the Draft Plan Rollout and 1 more committee meeting where the committee will finalize a recommended Subarea Plan and forward it on to the Planning Commission.

- Jan asked about how the committee will address the individual members' comments on the draft plan. Matt said that it was o.k. for individuals to send out informational comments to the Committee. Amy asked whether Bill Grimes will be issuing a summary and how that information would be distributed. Matt answered that it hasn't been planned out yet. Jan suggested that the two newspapers may help with that.

Opportunity for committee members to raise issues or discuss matters not on the agenda.

- Amy said just so the audience knows, that she has responded in detail to the discussion that was held at the last meeting about her communication with Studio Cascade. In summary, in terms of the open space policy issues that were raised the information that she transmitted was information that the committee already had, there was nothing in the minutes indicating that it was rejected and totally denied and dismissed. It was submitted primarily for informational purposes with no indication that it was any attempt to try and change any policy or votes that the committee had taken.

With regard to the report on the 2005 Comprehensive Plan subcommittee report, that never was sent to Bill Grimes. I had indicated that I was planning on doing it but I never did and the allegations that I had apparently went into quite some detail, which I think is unfortunate and inappropriate.

I would also like to state that in terms of a comment that I saw in the minutes from the last meeting, the comment that I had "done the same thing with the light industrial and economic policy". I have absolutely no idea what the source of that comment was. I had sent one short email to Richard Banel about that, never had a document with comments, and that was never sent to Studio Cascade. So I would like to go on the record that as far as I was concerned in no point in time had I attempted to bypass the public process.

- Sean had two responses, (1) Amy failed to recognize that she specifically included a passive directive to the consultant to perhaps include it in the text that he was preparing. This committee did not agree to that in an open public meeting, which we are required to do, and therefore it effectively changed the decision of this group not to include that in the text. (2) In response to the submissions to the group on the Subarea plan those were agreed to be sent directly to the consultant and we were not to deliberate on them until the fall after they had been compiled and delivered to this group for deliberation. Effectively by putting them in the public record they are going to get to the consultant. I assume the consultant will be taking the public record into account as he compiles the draft Subarea Plan which means he will have an opportunity to review those comments which puts the rest of this committee in kind of an awkward position. Maybe I have a misunderstanding of how that works but I feel that if a majority of this group had at that time got on board with the idea of submitting comments we would be violating what we had agreed to in public before you folks. We had agreed not to do anything with that until August or autumn and so if we didn't respond then we run the risk of not having our voices heard as well and our comments included in the draft plan which puts us at an unfair advantage. That is why I think the process question that was deliberated by this group last week was important. It wasn't to point fingers or make anyone feel bad. It

was to clarify what the process should be and I think that the actions of the committee last week were appropriate to address those things. I hope nobody had hurt feelings because that's not what it's about. It's about getting clarification on the process.

- Sean as an individual submitted to Matt a legal description of the commercial overlay in the Columbia Valley UGA. It is for the proposed Aiki commercial center.
- Jan, commenting on Sean response, stated that there is nothing in the minutes that specifically states or implies that other committee members are not allowed to comment on the other subcommittee's work. If you read from these minutes it says that the subcommittees agree to send their work to Matt he will then forward those documents to Bill Grimes. There is nothing there that says you couldn't comment on them. I fully expected our subcommittee to have our subcommittee draft done sooner. I apologize for that and fully expected other committee members to make comments on that also.
- Gary said that he hopes that the committee is now past these issues and that when the committee comes back in September that they can all work together and get a really good plan out of the deal. Jan agreed saying she thinks the main reason some of the issues needed to be brought up is because they were in print and it needs to be reflected in the public record that what was put in print was not true.

Public Comment-Second Period

- Karen Reich asked whether, when the plan is handed out to the committee in August, will it also be posted on the website? Matt answered yes.
- Mike Head said that he was pleased to see that a SEPA environmental review is part of the Subarea Plan process. It doesn't seem like the environment comes up very much in these discussions. Other impact issues like traffic are being addressed and he would like to see more about the environment. He's not sure that one month is enough time for the SEPA official to do an evaluation. Mike also talked about the role of the Tribe in the environmental portion of the Subarea Plan. He would like to see the Tribe take a position in environmental matters. He has contacted the Tribe and attempted to discuss the environmental matters with them but hasn't gotten any response.
- Jack Hovenier with Holly and Associates, SC Goshen. They own an 80-acre piece of property (RF) in the eastern part of the UGA. That piece has been consistently addressed as where growth is going to be and it's been in all the population forecasts. He thinks that in the final document it should be UR4 as it will have homes built on it. They will be asking for this in September when this comes back.
- Larry Duncan voiced his opposition to expanding the light industrial area that appears to be 160 acres. He thinks that the committee should have some type of language that shows that if one acreage goes into light industrial then that would eliminate these other parcels. What he sees the committee doing is creating industrial sprawl.
- Bill Coleman asked Mike Head to connect him so that he can get Mike's concerns addressed.

Adjournment

Adjournment
Meeting adjourned.

Submitted by: Pam Brown