From:	becky goodell
To:	Amy Rusko
Subject:	Comment Island Crossing
Date:	Monday, September 15, 2025 12:36:34 PM
Attachments:	CommentIslX0925.pdf Island Crossing comment091525.pdf

---

This message is from an External Sender
This message came from outside the City of Arlington

Hi Amy,

Attached are 2 signed letters offering comment for tomorrow's meeting. One from my brothers as well as myself and one from just me. See you tomorrow

Sincerely,

Rebecca Skelton Goodell

Skelton
2431 SR 530, Arlington WA 98223

becky.goodell@gmail.com, stu@thestewardshipco.com, craigaskelton@gmail.com
360-708-0362

Date: September 15th, 2025

City of Arlington
City Council
238 N Olympic Ave
Arlington, WA 98223

RE: Concerns Regarding Island Crossing Subarea Plan

Dear Mayor, Members of the City Council, and Planning & Development Staff,

We are writing to express our deep concern about the direction of the proposed Island Crossing Subarea Plan currently under consideration. As landowners and stakeholders in this uniquely situated area, we appreciate the opportunity to participate in the planning process and would like to share our perspective regarding the plan's potential impacts on both property values and the long-standing function of this important commercial zone.

Island Crossing is currently zoned for highway commercial uses and is strategically located adjacent to I-5. It is surrounded by productive farmland and lacks nearby residential neighborhoods, pedestrian infrastructure, or transit connections. For decades, this area has served the traveling public through services such as truck stops, gas stations, hotels, quick-service restaurants, and other transportation-related businesses—uses that are consistent with the existing zoning and vital to the regional economy.

While we understand and support the City's interest in long-term growth and planning, we have significant concerns about the proposal to transform Island Crossing into a walkable, mixed-use community. Such a vision may be appropriate in more urbanized settings, but it is fundamentally mismatched with Island Crossing's geography, land use context, and transportation role. The key components of walkable development—housing, employment centers, schools, and transit access—are not present in this area and are unlikely to emerge due to the surrounding agricultural uses and the site's separation from the urban core.

In addition, the plan's call for substantial infrastructure investments raises serious concerns. As currently drafted, these costs would fall largely on future landowners and developers. At the same time, the plan proposes to limit or eliminate freeway-serving uses such as truck stops—uses that remain the most viable and economically productive for this location. This creates a troubling imbalance: increasing financial burdens while reducing the economic utility and value of the land.

We believe that this approach risks devaluing private property without adequate compensation. If the City limits a landowner's ability to pursue the highest and best use of their property, it should consider mechanisms to offset this loss—whether through reduced development fees, infrastructure credits, or other forms of fair compensation. Alternatively, if the City envisions a fundamentally different future for Island Crossing, it should consider acquiring the affected properties at fair market value to ensure

that the cost of transformation is borne equitably by all taxpayers, rather than disproportionately by individual landowners.

Restricting key freeway-oriented services would not only diminish property values but could also reduce Arlington's role as a transportation hub, shifting essential services to neighboring jurisdictions and weakening the City's regional economic presence. The types of uses envisioned in the current plan may not generate sufficient return to support the level of investment required, making future development financially impractical under the proposed framework.

We respectfully urge the City to reconsider this approach and instead reaffirm Island Crossing's role as a highway commercial hub. Preserving this identity aligns with historical land use, supports continued economic development, and maintains essential services for the traveling public and freight corridors.

We remain committed to working collaboratively with the City to develop a plan that respects the area's unique context and supports its long-term economic vitality.

Sincerely,

Rebecca S Goodell

Stuart Skelton

Craig Skelton

FROM THE DESK OF

REBECCA SKELTON GOODELL

September 15, 2025

Amy Rusko, CED Director (arusko@arilingtonwa.gov)
City of Arlington Community and Economic Development
18204 59th Ave NE
Arlington, WA 98223

Re: Island Crossing Subarea Plan

Dear Amy Rusko and planning commission members,

I write as a land owner within the Island Crossing Subarea to express my concerns with the current proposed land use zoning restrictions. The proposed plan is laudable for its core mission of flood mitigation and creating a functional and visually pleasing gateway to the City of Arlington. With respect to utilizing its natural gifting and maximizing tax revenue for the city I contend that the plan falls woefully short.

Island Crossing is ideally positioned as a transportation hub. Our family property, along with our Kazen family neighbors, experiences strong demand to that end. We have entertained numerous offers from transportation entities wanting to purchase our Freeway Services zoned property for the purpose of building a truck stop. 'Another truck stop?", you say. Yes! When the infrastructure is in place for a truck stop it doesn't have to be duplicated elsewhere. I contend that to ignore the extreme need for more truck stops and the higher than typical tax revenue available from them is a misuse of a valuable city resource.

As the Pilot station so adequately demonstrates, truck stops provide significant tax revenue AND can be aesthetically pleasing. Needed traffic flow upgrades for that station can accommodate two stations, the cost of which is more easily justified by doubled revenue. Rather than excluding the possibility of more trucks why not optimize traffic flow and revenue. You are in a position to establish development criteria that meets your core goals of flood mitigation, aesthetically pleasing gateway, and drawing traffic off the freeway in the direction of Arlington proper where you have made lovely development improvements of which the Centennial trail is a key element. I highly support an east-

REBECCA SKELTON GOODELL

7830 PARKER RD, SEDRO WOOLLEY, WA 98284 360-708-0362

west non-motorized path inviting community recreation and tourism to downtown Arlington. Such a path can and should be made a part of any development plan.

The idea of a single ball field as a flood mitigation strategy is pure folly. Who will pay to clean up the property after the first flood that leaves logs, sticks, and debris piled against the fences. The city? Not hardly. Truck stops on the other hand have the financial resources to clean up and reopen in 24 hours with all the mobile customers safely moved out of the way. What revenue will a single ball field bring in? Insignificant!! Ball field complexes on the other hand fill restaurants and hotels. I heartily support Ag tourism and a ball field complex but please think clearly on this and work with the county to move it up the highway at least a mile closer to town where it will be safer from floods and draw traffic closer to your lovely town.

Please reconsider your prohibition of truck stops. Don't judge truck stops by the current west side example. Pilot is more reflective of what we envision. The developer we favor builds aesthetically pleasing facilities with restaurants, EV charging, convenience store, and lodging. Before making any final decisions please do due diligence. Engage in conversation with reputable developers such as Loves Travel Stops. Learn what development demands and restraints you can reasonably establish to meet your core goals in an economically viable and sustainable manner. It is my contention that your current plan falls short of those goals.

Sincerely yours,

Rebecca Skelton Goodell