

**Mediated Role Determination Panel
Snohomish County Admin Building
First Floor Meeting Room
November 9, 2006**

MEETING MINUTES

MRD Panel Members

Don Doran	Tom Gaffney	Michelle Robles	Mark Wolken
Ray Stephanson	Tom Hoban	John Shaw	Kevin Laverty
A.J. Chase	Lori Kaiser	Hugh Townsend	Gary Haakenson

Technical Advisors

Russ Keyes	John Sibold
------------	-------------

Snohomish County Staff

Peter Camp	Bill Dolan	Bailiff, Kerri	Bruce Goetz
Dave Waggoner	Jim Maynard	Nona Anderson	Christie Baumel

The meeting was called to order at 2:35. Introductions were made.
The minutes for the June 15, 2006 and October 18, 2006 were approved.

There were no public comments.

Christie Baumel, senior planner for Snohomish County Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS), distributed a short paper addressing comments and questions raised by MRD panel members at her last presentation to the group in May. She then presented, "Local Legislative Controls: GMA and Paine Field", which described the relationship between state, regional, county and city comprehensive planning and development regulations.

The presentation addressed the Airport's status as an Essential Public Facility (EPF) and the requirements of the state Growth Management Act (GMA) for communities surrounding the airport to plan for EPF siting and expansion and the GMA requirement to plan for compatible uses around the airport. She explained how Paine Field is addressed in various sections of the County's Comprehensive plans dealing with land use, economic development, transportation and capital improvements. She described County's General Policy Plan Facilities chapter addressing the Paine Field Airport:

The Master Plan identifies aviation demand and facility requirements at Paine Field through 2021. Regional Air Service consistent with the 1978/79 MRD for the airport is included in the forecasts and projections

and capital facilities to accommodate demand are included in the approved Development Plan (CIP) portion of the Airport Master Plan.

The plan includes the following text from by the Snohomish County Council motion 01-255 adopting the forecasts for the Airport Master Plan update:

The county has had a General Aviation Role policy since 1978/79 with the 'objective to retain and enhance light aircraft general aviation as the dominant aeronautical activity at Paine Field while encouraging the continuation and expansion of aircraft related industries, business and corporate aviation, public service aviation, air taxi and commuter service, and strongly discouraging expansion beyond 1978 levels of supplemental/charter air passenger service, large transport crew training operations, air cargo aviation and military aviation while remaining compliant with the covenants in deeds and grants of the United States Government.

Discussion ensued regarding the Airport Master Plan, County and city comprehensive plans and how they reflected the MRD document. Don Doran asked how the county's comprehensive plan was consistent with the Puget Sound Regional Councils (PSRC) resolution 9303 which removed supplemental airports from its recommendation?

Ms. Baumel noted that the PSRC planning policies identify Paine Field as a Manufacturing industrial Center (MIC). The MIC designation is a criteria used in prioritizing funding for transportation improvement funding around urban centers.

Dave Waggoner noted that Paine Field did not meet PSRC's definition of major supplemental airport because it lacked a parallel air carrier runway capable of simultaneous instrument operations.

Hugh Townsend asked who decides when expansion will happen and is necessary if GMA requires the County plan siting and expansion of airports, yet the state only provides policy guidelines? Who has the final say?

Peter Camp said that County Council would be the ultimate decision maker regarding encouraged uses at Paine Field. Any demand by an air carrier could force expansion. Council would direct staff to amend documents as necessary.

Lori Kaiser compared airport expansion with critical areas under GMA. Those that disagree with the legislative body's action appeal the alleged lack of compliance to a hearings board. There are multiple paths for challenging an action.

Mark Wolken stated that the Master Plan contains the Regional Low forecast. Should someone want to do something that is within the Regional Low, is it

correct that there would still have to be an environmental review. Who would pay for that? Could that effort could trigger policy changes?

Michelle Robles said that right now the airline operations included in the Regional low forecast is only a prediction, not a mandate, but she was concerned that once service begins it would . She thought that once the airport is open for scheduled air passenger service, anyone can come.

Ray Stephanson asked if the GMA requires the Master Plan? Ms Baumel responded that the FAA requires an Airport Master Plan if the County wishes to compete for federal grant funding of capital improvement projects at the airport. They are completely different processes. The GMA deals with the land use issues associated with the Airport.

Mr. Stephenson asked if the GMA recognizes the MRD and Ms Baumel noted that the GMA required county comprehensive plan acknowledges the MRD.

Ms. Kaiser stated that if the MRD had not been in place, the Mukilteo Comprehensive Plan would be very different. The MRD guided zoning decisions, and decisions as to where schools would be located. The Harbour Pointe development was carried out with the understanding that the MRD was a valid document.

In an effort to expedite the panel's role, which is to update the MRD, Peter Camp would like to draft a Final Report recognizing the points that the panel agrees on and the issues that there is no agreement. The next meeting will be a work session focusing on this document so that a final report can be presented at the December 14 final meeting. If there is large support to change the document, it will need to go to the County Council.

Tom Gaffney asked who will do the wordsmith? John Shaw's concern is how to make the language intelligible? A glossary would be useful. Mr. Gaffney stated that it seems like we are creating a new document and asked if that would eliminate some of the confusion? He asked if this would actually be a 2006 Amendment, or a final report?

Mr. Camp said he will write a report that will include updating the language of the document to reflect the current situation.

Ms. Kaiser believes that writing a new document would be like lighting a fire. How much of this is going to change with minor, or major, clarifications? The Panel can't determine if we need a new document until it finds out how it differs. There will be no consensus on certain issues.

Mr. Wolken is still not convinced that we really need to change it. We have the Master Plan, and other documents. Do we need a new document? Does this provide value? We have public involvement in the County's Airport Master Plan and Comprehensive Plan processes already. Mr. Stephanson asked staff if the Airport Master Plan is consistent with the MRD.

Bill Dolan responded that the 1995 and 2002 updates of the Airport Master Plan both discuss the Mediated Role Determination. He explained how the County Council reaffirmed the role when adopting the forecasts for the master plan. Mr. Dolan encouraged panel members to review the CD he provide in March which included the 1978 Paine Field Community Plan (PFCP) and its appendices. He said that document included analysis of the alternative roles and was the basis for the 1978/9 Mediated Role Determination. He also noted that the forecast section of the PFCP included definitions of many of the terms used in the role.

Ms. Robles stated that the community was built around the Airport because of the MRD. It has historical content. We are not changing the role. If it is not a good by-product, did we clean it up? She would like to think that this year has been productive. Mr. Stephanson declared that our role is to streamline government, and not to replicate it. If it is redundant, and it took us a year to get here, so be it.

Ms. Kaiser stated that the County Comprehensive Plan is a broad policy statement, but that the MRD adds clarity to it and the Panel's job is to make the MRD clearer. The Airport Master Plan is a process to get grants to improve the airport with a singular focus. The MRD gives context at the County level to all the planning policies.

Mr. Wolken said that the MRD was good for its time. Using an analogy of the Magna Carta, he said it was used as a basis, but was not included in the Constitution.

Ms. Kaiser declared that we can't say that the MRD's General Aviation Role hasn't worked, and we can't say it is not relevant because it is hard to read. We should do more than just review it.

Mr. Doran told the Panel that Mr. Kirsch said that many airports that have policy vision statements like the MRD and rarely updated them. The Panel's objective might be able to make the document less scary.

Mr. Camp used a power point presentation to show a MRD Document Outline with 5 major elements. He provided a handout of the draft annotated MRD Document to panel members and told the Panel that their homework is to review determine what changes they would recommend be made. He asked members to try to get input back to him so that he can bring a correlated version to the next

meeting. The outline was developed to make the process easier. What has changed, what is the same? What do you agree on, what do you disagree with?

The meeting adjourned at 4:25.