

**ISLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY MINUTES
COMMISSIONERS HEARING ROOM
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2006**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ray Gabelein Alan Schell
Bill Massey Wayne Havens
Wayne Havens Mike Joselyn
Sheilah Crider

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deb Eidsness Val Hillers

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Bill Massey moved to approve the minutes of August 8, 2006 & August 22, 2006 as written. The motion was seconded by Sheilah Crider and carried unanimously.

ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no items from the public

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Adoption of Findings of Fact for 2006 Annual Review Docket items

The Planning Commission was provided with Findings for ZAA 047/06, Lenz Enterprises- Zoning Change from R to RV, ZAA 475/05 – Simmons - Zoning Change from RS to RV, and CPA 167/06 NAS Whidbey Island, Accident Potential Zones. Findings for CPA 191/06 Stanwood/Camano School District will be emailed to the members.

Mike Joselyn moved to take action on all the Findings at their meeting on October 10, 2006. The motion was seconded by Sheilah Crider and carried unanimously.

Bill Massey pointed out that the Commission has denied ZAA 475/05 and therefore the language in the findings that pertains to adopting the proposed amendment should be stricken.

“The Island County Planning Commission has reviewed ZAA 475/05 and hereby recommends that the Board of Island County Commissioners adopt the ~~proposed amendment~~ and findings of fact.”

Ray Gabelein asked if the County would be contacting all the affected property owners.

Jeff Tate indicated that the County will contact owners of potentially subdividable parcels irrespective of what the land use is.

NEW BUSINESS

County Wide population projections & allocations/UGA

Handouts:

Power Point Presentation – Population updates for County Urban Growth Areas (Growth Management Record #8949)

Jeff Tate noted that staff brought this item which is referred to as, CPA 155/04, to the Planning Commission during the 2004 annual review docket. This item is review and update of the population projections and Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) in Island County.

There are some work products that staff will need to bring to the Planning Commission in order to effectuate the necessary changes:

- Review and update the Island County Comprehensive Plan
- Review and update the County Wide Planning Policies
- Review and update the Interlocal Agreements & maps

John Coleman, Planner, provided a power point presentation.

History of Project

- 2004 – Staff presented Planning Commission with range of population projections for the entire County.
- Three projections for the year 2025 based on State Office of Financial Management (OFM) numbers
 - Low – 83, 137
 - Medium – 101, 079
 - High – 119,021
- Planning Commission deliberated on figures and decided that a compromise between the medium and high figure was most appropriate
- Medium/High Projection of 110,050 persons for entire County was adopted
- Forwarded projection to cities and towns so they could incorporate the numbers into their population projections.

Where we are now

- Cities/towns have complete their respective population projection processes

- Staff will present the Planning Commission with the projections that cities have adopted
- Staff, with guidance from the Planning Commission, will incorporate cities' projections into the County Comprehensive Plan.

Brief Overview

- Review the County Projections
 - Old projections
 - Newest projections
 - Range of projections by Region
- Discuss the city/town projections
 - Coupeville
 - Langley
 - Oak Harbor

Population Projections

Projections	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
1998 Comprehensive Plan	81,500	88,628	98,700	108,967	118,800	-----
2000 OFM Low Projection	71,558	69,693	72,988	76,708	80,210	83,137
2000 OFM Medium Projection	71,558	74,738	80,650	87,416	94,365	101,079
2000 OFM High Projection	71,558	79,783	88,312	98,124	108,520	119,021
Medium High Projection	71,558	77,261	84,481	92,770	101,443	110,050

Planning Area Population in 2000

Total Population by Region

	1990	2000
North Whidbey	34,592	34,737
Oak Harbor UGA	17,176	19,795
Unincorporated	17,416	14,942
Central Whidbey	8,205	9,467
Coupeville UGA	1,377	1,723
Unincorporated	6,828	7,744
South Whidbey	10,069	14,007
Langley UGA	845	959

Unincorporated	9,224	13,048
Camano	7,329	13,347
Total for Island County	60,195	71,558

Planning Area Population Based on Medium/High Projection and Historic Proportionate Share

Planning Area	2000	2010	2020	2025
North Whidbey	34,737	40,551	46,664	49,523
Central Whidbey	9,467	10,138	12,173	12,106
South Whidbey	14,007	17,741	23,317	25,312
Camano	13,347	16,051	20,289	23,111
Total	71,558	84,481	101,443	110,050

Planning Area Population Based on Medium/High Projection and Area Specific Growth

Planning Area	2000	2010	2020	2025
North Whidbey	34,737	40,642	47,958	51,795
Central Whidbey	9,467	10,605	11,984	12,823
South Whidbey	14,007	16,948	21,211	23,113
Camano	13,347	16,283	20,288	22,319
Total	71,558	84,478	101,443	110,050

Change in Population by Planning Area

Planning Area	2000	2025	Actual Increase	% Increase
North Whidbey				
Proportion	34,737	49,523	14,786	38%
Growth	34,737	51,795	17,058	44%
Central Whidbey				
Proportion	9,467	12,106	2,638	7%
Growth	9,467	12,823	3,355	9%
South Whidbey				
Proportion	14,007	25,312	11,305	29%
Growth	14,007	23,113	9,106	24%
Camano				
Proportion	13,347	23,111	9,764	25%

Growth	13,347	22,319	8,972	23%
Total	71,558	110,050	38,492	53.8%

- Using the population method and the growth method and the growth method, we have arrived at a range of population growth in each region
- This does not mean the county population projection is a range
- Regional populations in 2025
 - North Whidbey 49,523 to 51,795
 - Central Whidbey 12,106 to 12,823
 - South Whidbey 23,113 to 25,312
 - Camano 22,319 to 22,111

Coupeville Population Projections

- Special case does not need to accommodate growth or expand UGA – in Historic District
- The city has projected a population of 2,165 for the year 2025
- This is 165 more than it had projected for 2020 in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan
- No need to expand UGA

Langley Population Projections

- In the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, Langley’s 2020 population was projected to be 2,200
- As a result of the 2000 census information that yielded a smaller population than anticipated, Langley will extend its projection of 2,200 from 2020 out to 2025.
- No need to expand UGA

Oak Harbor Population Projections

- Developed population projection for 2025 based on the number of permits the city has issued over the past 5 years
- Projected a population of 30,419 in 2025
- This is 518 fewer than the 2020 projection stated in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan
- Performed a Buildable Lands Analysis
- Found that the capacity within current UGA can meet 106% of projected housing need.

Oak Harbor UGA expansion

- Concluded more land needed to be included in UGA
- City solicited letter of interest from property owners wanting to have their property considered for inclusion in the UGA.
- Comprehensive Plan Task Force recommended seven additions to the UGA.

- Additional land at the recommended density creates a UGA that will accommodate 126.5% of the City’s projected growth through the year 2025.

Planning Area Projections using proportion calculation including UGAs

Planning Area	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
North Whidbey	34,737	37,085	40,551	42,674	46,664	49,523
Oak Harbor	19,795					30,419
Unincorporated	14,942					19,104
Central Whidbey	9,467	10,044	10,183	11,132	12,173	12,106
Coupeville	1,723	1,808	1,893	1,978	2,068	2,165
Unincorporated	7,744	8,057	8,753	9,521	10,181	10,941
South Whidbey	14,007	16,225	17,741	20,409	22,317	25,312
Langley	959	1,050	----	----	----	2,200
Freeland		1,380	1,656	2,153	2,906	4,000
Unincorporated	13,048	13,795	----	----	----	19,112
Camano	13,347	13,907	16,051	18,554	20,289	23,111
Total	71,558	77,261	84,481	92,770	101,443	110,050

Planning Area projections using growth calculation including UGAs

Planning Area	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
North Whidbey	34,737	36,858	40,642	44,093	47,958	51,795
Oak Harbor	19,795					30,419
Unincorporated	14,942					21,376
Central Whidbey	9,467	9,865	10,605	11,456	11,984	12,823
Coupeville	1,723	1,808	1,850	1,935	2,068	2,165
Unincorporated	7,744	8,057	8,753	9,521	10,181	10,941
South Whidbey	14,007	15,548	16,948	18,982	21,211	23,113
Langley	959	1,050	----	----	----	2,200
Freeland		1,380	1,656	2,153	2,906	4,000
Unincorporated	13,048	13,121	----	----	----	16,913
Camano	13,347	14,989	16,283	18,237	20,288	22,319
Total	71,558	77,261	84,481	92,770	101,443	110,050

The County's first step was to go through and evaluate the process that the three municipalities went through and come up with a recommendation. Over the last couple of months staff has had the opportunity to have some dialog with the three municipalities, primarily the City of Oak Harbor. The city has been very accommodating in walking county staff through their process and describing how they got to the recommendation they forwarded on to the County.

Staff will need to write up a recommendation, draft the amendments and issue a SEPA threshold determination. Staff's recommendation needs to be forwarded to the state agencies for their review as well.

This issue will be continued to the Planning Commission's October 10th meeting at which time staff will provide the amendments as one complete package.

Bill Massey asked if staff looked at the two methods of projecting growth relative to what has actually happened between 2000 and 2005 for the entire County.

Jeff Tate noted that the medium/high population projections in 2004 were based on building permit and trend data from 1998 up to 2004. The Planning Commission was presented with spreadsheets showing how many building permits were being issued from 1998 to 2004 and then trending that out and coming up with an average over that time span. Obviously data has been collected since 2004 and if the Planning Commission wants, staff can go back and evaluate that data to see if it has enough of an affect to cause the Planning Commission to reevaluate the projections. If that changes the 2025 county wide projection it sort of trickles backwards on how it affects the work staff has done with Langley, Coupeville and Oak Harbor

Bill Massey asked what cut off date Oak Harbor used for collecting their building permit data.

Steve Powers, Director of Development Services for the City of Oak Harbor, indicated that it was a two stage process. They worked with the county staff in 2004 and got to the raw population projection in the context of the county number at the tail end of 2004, beginning of 2005. The more detailed process in terms of looking at the individual population projections within the city and relative to their buildable lands analysis took into account permit data through the end of 2004 and into part of 2005.

Bill Massey noted that the Planning Commission came up with a number based on information that was presented up through 2004 and Oak Harbor's report goes beyond that.

Steve Powers said it does from the extend that the City of Oak Harbor has used the last five years of permit data from 2004 backwards as part of their projection forward. The City looked at the 20 year historical number and then more specifically at that last 5 years and used that as part of the process.

Larry Cort, Senior Planner for the City of Oak Harbor, noted that when they started looking at what their population projections would be based on the most recent information from OFM was from April of 2004 so that was set as their baseline. They looked back at the past 20 years and the past 5 years average for building permits. The 5 year average was slightly lower than the 20 year average, however the 20 year average included a massive introduction to multi-family housing. They used that 20 year horizon fine-tuned to 5 years and the buildable lands analysis which was based on available residential capacity in April 2004. There were a number of assumptions made about what would and would not be included in the capacity and that level of detail has been provided to county staff to support the numbers.

Ray Gabelein asked how the census information takes into account seasonal population.

Jeff Tate noted that the census data, within each individual census tract, actually includes information on seasonal population.

Ray Gabelein asked how the buildable lands analysis accounted for lots that are presently unbuildable.

Jeff Tate explained that the County is not obligated to go through that analysis. When the City of Oak Harbor was considering what lands may likely be developed over this planning horizon they were also considering the provision of urban services to facilitate that development and assuming when they go through that process that there is going to be sewer and water to serve the vast majority of that development.

When you size an UGA boundary there is an obligation to come up with a reasoned approach that establishes that you are not going above that 125% threshold and if you do go above it you have to provide some really good reasons for that.

Sheilah Crider asked if critical areas that require buffering and can't be built on can be extracted from the overall population availability to meet that 125%.

Jeff Tate said part of the analysis is to factor in the presence of critical areas and their buffers. The reason for that 25% buffer is because the growth board has said a municipality should be able to have enough extra land in its area so that market conditions are not influenced by the size of the UGA. However, if you have a 20 acre piece of property with 5 acres of wetland you can't just automatically consider that 5 acres as undevelopable and remove it because by county code you could still achieve the density on the remaining 15 acres by clustering. You have to start breaking it down even narrower and determine at what point a critical area consumes so much property that you are not going to be able to average out the density.

Briefing from GSA on Hazard Mitigation Plan

Handouts: Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

Jeff Tate noted that the County is engaged in hazard planning and has prepared a draft hazard mitigation plan. A lot of the regulations and policies that come before the Planning Commission and are ultimately adopted by the BICC are affectively mitigation tools.

Mike Simmons, Department of Emergency Management, presented the following power point presentation.

Emergency Management Cycle

- *Mitigation leads the Emergency Management Cycle.*
- *Mitigation actions are those actions done to lessen or eliminate the impact of a disaster or emergency.*
- *Planning is part of mitigation – plans, codes, ordinances, zoning, and land use are all mitigation actions.*

Why do we need a Hazard Mitigation Plan?

- Mitigation saves lives and money.
- Large mitigation projects are expensive.
- Access to Federal grants requires an approved hazard mitigation plan (44 CFR Part 201.6 & Section 322).
-

Island County Natural Hazards

Drought
Earthquake
Flood
Severe Storm
Tsunami
Volcano
Interface Fire

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan

- Every jurisdiction wanting to participate in Federal mitigation grants needs a plan
- The multi-jurisdictional plan simplifies the process and workload.

Current Plan Program

- Draft Plan is nearly complete.

- A number of Island County special tax districts are participating.
- Final Draft to be completed by the end of October.

What can the Planning Commission do?

- Ask for a review of the draft plan.
- Provide comments, recommendations.
- Encourage mitigation plan participation by county jurisdictions.
- Consider hazard mitigation as a critical element in all future planning actions.

He noted that a number of Island County jurisdictions have indicated they want to participate in the plan. The plan contains provisions for local jurisdictions to be able to join the plan at a later date. This plan is not a one time effort; it is a living document that will be updated at least every other year.

The approval process for this plan requires each participating jurisdiction to formally adopt the plan. Island County drafts the plan with the participating jurisdictions input, those jurisdictions review it, adopt it and issue a resolution. All of those approval documents become part of the plan and everybody that joins it after that goes through the same process.

Bill Massey pointed out that the Planning Commission over the last few years has addressed a lot of those issues, including geologically hazardous areas and steep slopes.

Jeff Tate agreed that it was a fairly natural fit for the Planning Commission to be involved in this given what they have reviewed over the last couple of years. He noted that once this plan is prepared there will be an opportunity for water systems, fire districts and any of these other multi-jurisdictional agencies that are involved to get grant funding to improve their emergency preparedness. At this point staff will be reviewing the plan and will bring it back before the Planning Commission for further discussion.

Sheilah Crider asked if the three municipalities, Langley, Coupeville and Oak Harbor are required to have a plan ancillary to this plan.

Mike Simmons noted that this plan is multi-jurisdictional and participation only requires input from the jurisdiction and approval of the document when it is finished.

Sheilah Crider said her concern was if those jurisdictions do not provide input into the plan then they could potentially be left out of any kind of federal grants.

Mike Simmons explained that money from the federal government to fix things because of some kind of storm damage will not be affected by this plan. What is affected are preventive measures, reconstruction of something now so it doesn't get washed away by a storm in the future. They need to continue to get the word out to these junior jurisdictions to let them know about this plan and their need to participate.

The meeting adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pam Dill
Administrative Assistant