

Skagit County Board of County Commissioners
Work Session: PC Recommendations on 2023 Docket Petitions
December 4, 2023

Commissioners: **Commissioner Ron Wesen, Chair (District 1)**
 Commissioner Peter Browning (District 2)
 Commissioner Lisa Janicki (District 3)

PDS Staff: **Jack Moore, Planning Director**
 Sarah Ruether, Long Range Planner
 Robby Eckroth, Long Range Planner

Chair Ron Wesen: (gavel) Good afternoon. I'd like to call this session of the Skagit County Commissioners to order. It's a little after one o'clock on December 4th, 2023. We are here with Planning and Development Services so, Jack, what do you have for us today?

Jack Moore: Well, today our senior planner Sarah Ruether is presenting the 2023 Docket Recommendations.

Sarah Ruether: Good afternoon. We have the 2023 Docket Work Session. I'm Sarah Ruether, a senior planner with Planning and Development Services. To start out we'll just do a brief review of the process.

The Board of County Commissioners established the docket after a public hearing and petitions from both from the public and internally. This list was established by resolution. The Planning Commission then had multiple work sessions on it, a SEPA review was done, Commerce was also sent it for review, and then we had a public hearing on October 24th. And then, just on November 28th the Planning Commission gave their recommendations and we are at the last step of discussions with the Board on these recommendations.

Just to give a couple updates, docket item C23-7, Flow Sensitive Basin Rules, was rescinded. It was a County-initiated item – a Natural Resources – and it needs some additional technical changes. And for review, Fully Contained Communities – FCCs – are not on the 2023 docket. This item was removed by the Board of County Commissioners when they established the list of petitions.

The first one we'll discuss is LR23-01, the Dunlap Rural Reserve Rezone. The petitioner requests rezoning of approximately 21 acres, a portion of five parcels from Agricultural-Natural Resource Land to Rural Reserve. The portion of these parcels that was requested to be rezoned is not farmable because they're on the upland side of a hill – and I do have pictures – and the soils are not productive or agricultural or commercially significant. This rezone would allow the applicant to apply for a CaRD development and subdivide the property. The Planning Commission recommends approval of this petition.

And to review the photos, they want to rezone just along the toe of the hill. So it's 21 acres just along the toe of the hill, as you see on the red line right there. And this is just another photo to show how it's rocky. These are not Ag-NRL soils that can be farmed. And it's recommended for approval.

So the next one is LR23-03, Bayview Ridge Light Industrial. This petition requests to rezone part of one parcel, which is approximately 7.54 acres, from Bayview Ridge Residential to Bayview Ridge Light Industrial. Six-point-nine of those acres are already zoned Industrial and so this would be approximately 1.17 acres and it's currently zoned Bayview Ridge Residential. It's a split zone and it was a mistake.

The comments we received about this one were concerned with noise and traffic and other adverse impacts. There was a notice sent to property owners within 300 square feet of the zone. They were mailed to them. And the Port of Skagit has plans for a Watershed Business Park. They plan on fencing and a vegetative buffer with 100-foot separation between the residential and new commercial/industrial development to reduce visual and noise impacts.

And I will show the photos. Just to do the photos first, this is the portion of the parcel to be rezoned. The kind of area where the two colors overlap is that – the 1.1 acres. And this shows the hundred-foot buffer. It also – where the circle is – that shows where the proposed parcel would be for the rezone. And this is a sidecut to show what the vegetative buffer would look like, and it also shows the trails.

And then some of the comments: To address the comments, the Port did say that they would mitigate the noise and the truck traffic by requiring tenants to take the Higgins Way Airport Road, which is the red line, versus the Peterson Road. So to avoid, to mitigate that and avoid disturbing the neighborhood, they did agree to do that. I want to go over the other ways that they said they would mitigate, too. They also said that they would widen Peterson Road adjacent to the Port-owned property in order to extend the existing Peterson Road sidewalk, and new trails eventually to connect with the Port's existing 10-plus miles of the existing trail system. The Planning Commission recommended approval of this petition.

Commissioner Wesen: Once again, this is property owned by the Port so they're going to just lease the buildings. They're going to still own them.

Ms. Ruether: Yes, yes. This is owned by them, and it was an error of some sort that you had these multiple overlapping zones. You couldn't quite – Jenn was the one who started this and she did diligent digging and could not figure out why there was an error.

Commissioner Wesen: Yeah.

Ms. Ruether: Okay. The next one is C23-1, Seawater Intrusion. This petition would add language to the Skagit County Code 14.24.380(2) to require the following information to be submitted prior to drilling in a sole source aquifer:

- A site plan including inland well site location
- Estimated depth of the well
- Estimated land elevation of the well
- The depth of chloride levels of surrounding wells
- A drilling plan, and
- Applicable fees.

The petition would require County review prior to drilling in any wells drilled in the sole source aquifer – which Guemes is the only sole source aquifer – without a building permit. The intent was to close a loophole.

And for background, Guemes Island was designated a sole source aquifer by the EPA in 1997. The EPA defines “sole source aquifer” as an aquifer that supplies at least 50% of drinking water for its service area and has no reasonably available drinking water sources should the aquifer become contaminated.

The Planning Commission recommended denial of this petition. I included some of their Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action. To summarize maybe before I go through all of them, they felt like this was a violation of the property rights of an owner and they also felt like it was an undue burden put on that one property owner for some of the data required. So those were the items that we couldn't quite iron out in discussion of this. And I will go over their Findings of Facts and Reasons because they did come directly from them. But that's just my summary first.

So the first one was: The Department of Ecology is clearly recognized as the authority for permitting wells.

Petitioners request that those persons seeking a well permit from the County provide information about their neighbors' wells is unduly burdensome.

The rest of the Findings and Facts of Reason, I don't know if you want me to read through all of them. There were some RCWs that they selected out about kind of property rights and water rights and that. Their concern was that if someone wanted to farm or had horses or something like this that this would put undue pressure on them to assure the health of the aquifer, when it should be more of a community idea to have data on wells and that kind of a thing. So that was where we couldn't quite square it. I will say as a staff person it was a little difficult, too, because it was not – Jason, who is unfortunately not here, developed it and Natural Resources wasn't kind of 'in the room' when that was happening so there's a bit of a – it seemed like it was developed with a bit of a disconnect from someone who, as a long range planner, is going to each party to understand it.

That is one that we will need further feedback from you as we go forward. Were there any questions on here?

Chair Wesen: Commissioner Browning, any questions on that one?

Commissioner Peter Browning: Was there at least a recognition? The concern is valid – the concern of the people that – or this Board. So are we talking about possibly altering it and still being able to come up with a reasonable plan, or is – what's the process? Can we –

Ms. Ruether: Well, we'll go – you mean in terms of your role with it?

Commissioner Browning: Mm-hmm.

Ms. Ruether: We'll go over whether you want to modify. We could modify it. If you modify it in a significant way it has to re-go through SEPA and have another hearing. I mean, you can defer it. You could adopt it with modifications if you – like, you had modifications you thought would satisfy their concerns. But I think from the Planning Commission's standpoint, they were concerned that this treads on the rights of property owners to develop. And they also – Kathy is very meticulous, as I'm sure you know, in all her data and all of her collection, and she really wanted to get a USGS report on this and it hasn't come out yet, and so she was concerned, you know. As someone who used to do transportation planning, if you have, like, the last guy in and you require him to fix the

intersection when everyone else is the one who caused it to fail, I think that's from – you know, that's the metaphor that I see for them here, is like, Why are you going to make this all the last guy in's responsibility? And I – you know, I'm just telling you that's the disconnect, I think, maybe between the way it's proposed, and that's their concern on that one.

Commissioner Browning: You remember the discussion on this was if somebody was on the waterfront and the house behind them decided to put in a well, they'd be pulling water through and salinating the front well so that they could get water in the behind well, and so that was – the intent of this was so that they could make sure – I don't know. So as long as we keep in mind the intent of this is somebody building a house and putting in a well and then adversely impacting the wells around them. It's not – so....

Chair Wesen: It wasn't building the house, because if they're building a house they *have* to do the water currently.

Ms. Ruether: Right.

Chair Wesen: If somebody who's already got a house there and the well failed, _____.

Commissioner Lisa Janicki: It's a replacement well.

Commissioner Browning: Replacement. That was it. Yes.

Commissioner Janicki: The replacement well was the big issue with this.

Ms. Ruether: Right, or if you had a well that was not associated with a building permit, you know. From what I gather from Jason, it was a way – they were concerned it was a way to circumvent our process, you know. I don't know. That's, of course, the negative, devious way of looking at it.

Commissioner Browning: Yeah, I understand _____.

Ms. Ruether: There *are* circumstances where people might want a well without a building permit. They were also – process came up a lot in this. It's like, where is the DOE's responsibility versus the County's, and is this duplicative kind of bureaucracy and duplicative information that's going to make it more burdensome for the applicant? So those were the concerns that we just couldn't quite get them to feel like this was satisfying those.

Commissioner Browning: Well, great. I'm glad that's kind of the intent of this because that was very clear in that discussion up there that we needed to have a clear sense of purpose, a path, and we didn't want them going to two different places. We certainly didn't want them playing mom against dad either. So there's so many things that were problematic. Okay, good. Thank you.

Commissioner Janicki: Sarah, what is the – the USGS report that was – because there was a funding source from the legislature to get updated or expanded USGS information.

Ms. Ruether: Yeah, it is in process. It's just – I think when I asked Erin, who's the senior water resource, she said she doesn't think it's going to be completed till January. She gave me their website to pass down to Kathy that has, like, some of the data and stuff, but I think if you talk to a hydrologist there's just so many complicated items with this that it's really hard to sort through, unless you're a hydrologist, to completely understand all of those complicated issues behind it.

Commissioner Janicki: Well, I just – so I'll throw the – you know, the last developer who asked to do the intersection – you know, the flip side of that is, you know, the last one who still has land on Guemes and, you know, comes to a point in their life where can build that special place on that special island, can't do it because someone – it only takes one, or a couple –

Ms. Ruether: Right.

Commissioner Janicki: – to suck salt into the whole system. So how do you balance those property rights –

Ms. Ruether: Exactly.

Commissioner Janicki: – would be my question. It certainly should be informed by science. It isn't supposed to be ___. I never thought that it would be – and I don't know how to differentiate, but for the agricultural use, you know, that has been ongoing. But there's somewhere around the edges of that aquifer – and it's probably not even just such a nice circle like that – where it's more at risk of pulling saltwater in just because of the depths. But I don't think this conversation is done and I don't know how exactly to move forward, but I think we have to. It's the only sole source aquifer in Skagit County. The rules will be different for it versus anywhere else. So we still have some work to do, is my perspective on that.

Ms. Ruether: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Janicki: But not for the cows! Let the cows drink the water!

Chair Wesen: The cows can't afford to get across their own ferries!

(laughter)

Commissioner Janicki: Oh, so now that's a revenue reduction! No. Sorry, go ahead. Sorry.

Ms. Ruether: We'll go back to the easy ones. C23-2, Qualified Professional Definition. This would amend the definition of a "qualified professional" so it increases the years of experience required from two years to four years. It also refers the definition of a stormwater professional to the Skagit County Stormwater Manual for consistency so it kind of lines up the code in a better way. And if reports are incomplete or inaccurate, this is both a cost to the applicant and also slowed us down with project approval, so that was why it was requested by staff. And the proposal would increase the number of years' experience from two to four is based on adjacent jurisdictions' requirements, and the change will have the most impacts on wetlands and water courses as they don't have professional certifications – PEs – for these disciplines. And the Planning Commission recommended approval of this petition.

C23-3, OSRSI Allowed Uses. This is another more difficult one that the Planning Commission did not recommend approval. This amends Open Space of Regional and State Importance zone and allows trails as an outright permitted use. Right now currently there's a conflict in the code listing trails as both permitted outright and as an administrative special use. This petition was also submitted for the 2019 docket and the biggest issue was notice of development for interested parties.

The Planning Commission recommended denial of the petition. Their reasoning for this was – to summarize it, I will read the Findings and Fact. To summarize it was basically they felt like it was

a transparency issue of wanting to know, like, when trails are going in. And they weren't satisfied with staff's response of SEPA and grading permits of 500 cubic yards and critical areas. For them they felt like the 2019 item – that that was decided then and they didn't – you couldn't seem to persuade them differently. So they came up – I will go over their Facts of Finding (sic) and Reasons for Action just to summarize,

The Planning Commission finds that as staff turn over there can be different policies regarding how the code is interpreted, so they feel more – that was why they felt more comfortable with something that has to be noticed so they can be involved in the process – adjacent property owners. The Planning Commission finds that a Hearing Examiner Special Use review would put the proponent and public on a more even playing field.

Then they gave some Findings of Facts from the 2019 docket item about findings from the Forest Advisory Board, Comp Plan amendments, goals that would support it – or support denial. Which I have those written out here, if you want me to go over them. They also talked about the Countywide Planning Policies that would support denial of the petition.

Consistent with Goal 9 and Policy 9.1 and 9.2 of the Countywide Planning Policies.

The Planning Commission finds that providing notice is important to ensure that interested parties can participate in the review of proposed trails and trailheads.

You know, when I look at it, it's like SEPA. When they did a lot of modifications to SEPA they gave jurisdictions the choice of where to put some of your thresholds for it, so from the Planning Commission's standpoint, they like being – to have notice. I mean, I guess these are people who are very active in participating, and that was what they felt comfortable with. So any questions about how they got to that?

Chair Wesen: Commissioner Janicki?

Commissioner Janicki: So the reason that we had earlier – Skagit County had earlier modified code to allow for – or that would create allowed use for trails on public, because on OS – whatever that stands for – is Open Space, public lands of Open Space.

Ms. Ruether: Right.

Commissioner Janicki: Is because the DNR had a project in south Skagit County that is coming up from Darrington on DNR trust plan. The trail that was started in Snohomish County could not continue up North Mountain into Skagit County because we required a permit. The requires-a-permit is the first step of development, and so by their managing of trust lands they cannot develop trust lands, so they had to stop the trail. And so the change was put in place so that a trail on public lands with the setbacks – it didn't require any rock; it was all just – so we changed it, and we must not have hit all the sections that we were supposed to hit at the time. There was *extensive* conversation with Forest Advisory Board, who – they were concerned about bootleg trails or people coming on to private property. None of that was allowed. That's still considered trespass. So, you know, the argument when you've got thousands of acres of *public* land to put these trails on – I like Skagit – Skagit County has a mindset of being very accessible to the public for recreation. And on – the perfect place for that to happen is on public lands. So I think I'm just getting old. I'm too tired to fight this one. But I think we're a little wrongheaded in our thinking of taking away the opportunity for trails on the forested trust lands that the DNR manages.

Chair Wesen: Commissioner Browning?

Commissioner Browning: Well, I'm always an advocate for trails, and so if we're standing in the way of trails for no good reason then I'm uncomfortable with that. If there's a clear justification – I just want to make sure that we're absolutely crystal clear that trails are a *good* thing for our community and so tell me why I can't. Tell me it shouldn't be there. And I'm not sure what that process looks like. But for the most part, it's like, no, it's a trail.

Commissioner Janicki: They're concerned about the – and it does happen. I know having timberland out there that, you know, it can happen – that people, whatever shortcut, they're on a motorcycle for – they will create their own trails. But that is not what this is allowing, you know. Because they wouldn't have gotten a permit if there was a special use permit required to do that either. So it's a little bit frustrating because we've gone through this multiple times. But, yeah, I'm just going to stand on – you know, the intent is that we could have good, robust trails on public lands. And it didn't even include the parking lots. You know, the *trailheads* are definitely a permitted activity. This is just non-rocked trail on the mountainside.

Chair Wesen: And the question is: They were really concerned about going on the private property, so is there a way that you could do 100 yards from the boundary or property line, you know, or something? I'm just throwing something out there. I have no idea. Because we've done that on some other timber harvesting stuff –

Ms. Ruether: Maybe if there's a way to assure people that it would not be – the only ones that would be outright permitted are not anywhere near you. I mean, we also have islands that have trails that have no one for hundreds of miles. So, I mean, you know, it is true that they're not always apples to apples when you're – like people are concerned about something coming in in their backyard and not getting a say. I think that's the – that was the voice of the transparency but, you know, maybe it just needs to be amended to get some kind of nuance like that too. I don't know how you capture that in a legal way to assure people that we're not – nothing *close* to your backyard will be considered for this!

Commissioner Janicki: Yeah, I think of how robustly the DNR does, you know, install and maintain trails. Think of Blanchard Mountain, you know, right over there. You know, the level of those trails is higher impact than what we are talking about here with primitive. I don't even know if that's the right word. It was just they are going to scrape a path on the dirt and not put, you know, anything in up on North Mountain. That was the intent. We've got to keep places for people to, you know, be able to get out and recreate..

Ms. Ruether: No, believe me. I went to Zion for Thanksgiving and I hadn't been there for 13 years, and it was *crazy!* Utterly! I mean, I'm getting old too, obviously. I was just like – it's like Disney World! We should have taken our kids to Disney World! It's so busy. I feel like after Covid everyone is outdoors, and people who have been doing it all the time we're like – I can't – we can't be around this many people once you become rural again! We had to find other places to go!

Chair Wesen: That park is interesting because you get on the bus to go to the different trailheads. And so it's just –

Ms. Ruether: Right. There's people everywhere! So I do think – I do feel – I only brought that up to say I feel like people *are* getting out a lot more. There's a *lot* more demand. It's like people realized that this is a great thing to do in Covid, so I do feel like there's a demand for this and it has been growing. And I'm sure Brian could probably detail that more.

Chair Wesen: Yep.

Ms. Ruether: All right. The next one is C23-4, Master Planned Resort Designation. This amends code language to refer to a Master Planned Resort as its own designation, not a special use, to remain consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. This was an administrative error in a docket item that corrected that error. Examples of Master Planned Resorts: Crystal Mountain, Skamania Lodge, Sun Mountain Resorts. And the Planning Commission recommended approval of this petition.

C23-5, Fire Marshal Code Amendment. This removes the requirement for structures built outside of a fire district to have foam applicator for firefighting hoses. It takes training and diligence to keep up with the best practices and its toxicity to humans and the environment. This docket item does not prohibit its use. The firefighting foam has toxic chemicals that are dangerous to human health and the environment and water is now the accepted standard for firefighting. The Planning Commission recommends approval of this petition.

Chair Wesen: The change is our code *required* foam and now it's an optional for the property owner.

Ms. Ruether: Right. Like, if you had someone who was – a firefighter who was, like, diligently on this and, like, wanted to do it, they could. It's not prohibiting it. It's just, you know, a lot of people don't have – if you don't keep up with all the safety things, it's dangerous. And there's other foams that don't have the – whatever, PFAS, so it doesn't disallow the foams that don't have the PFAS in it. Yeah.

C23-6, Temporary Manufactured Homes Title Notice Requirement. This adds a new requirement for temporary manufactured homes to submit a title notice on the property. Temporary manufactured homes are required to be removed when the use is completed. And these are only allowed for medical reasons or farmworker housing. The property owner may apply for a permit for an ADU to make it permanent if they meet the requirements, so it just assures that everyone's fair and it's on the title notice. So also if someone buys a house ___ they might have thought they were getting an ADU and it turns out they're not. So it's just a transparency thing. And they recommended approval of this petition.

Commissioner Browning: And this keeps them from putting down houses and then just leaving them there forever?

Ms. Ruether: Yes. And apparently there was a problem with that.

Commissioner Browning: Yep.

Ms. Ruether: Or if it's not on the title, that you might buy a place and then you didn't know that what you have is not up to snuff. As you know, if you don't ask – because for a realtor, you don't have to tell. So nobody wants to ask in that discipline sometimes!

Commissioner Browning: Okay, thanks.

Ms. Ruether: C23-9, Primitive Campground Definition Amendment. This amends the definition of a "primitive campground" to clarify which amenities may be included in a campground and still be designed (sic) as primitive. It also refers to regulations for recreational vehicles to ensure primitive campgrounds are limited to two RVs maximum with only one RV inhabited. This is a simple code

change to put it in the prohibited list that was asked by Code Enforcement for a need for it because there was a little gray area of people calling things primitive when they were, you know, not tents. They were RVs.

C23-10, Countywide Planning Policies Update. This petition – this is a petition to adopt the changes to the Countywide Planning Policies by the GMA Steering Committee. The new language will direct the Board of County Commissioners to disband the Boundary Review Board by June 30th, 2025. And the Planning Commission recommended approval of this petition.

C23-11, just General Code Language Clean Up. When you update code, the stormwater, land disturbance, and wireless facilities have just small, minor errors that need to be changed, but in the spirit of transparency we're showing you all of our errors and correcting them. And the Planning Commission recommended approval of this.

So options for Board action:

- Adopt them as proposed
- Adopt the proposal with modifications with the caveat if it's way outside the scope, you have to re-notice and also do SEPA review and schedule a new public hearing. We could do that just with you and not have to go through the Planning Commission again, though.
- Decline to adopt the proposal or remand the issue back to the Department or Planning Commission for further study, or
- Defer the action on the docket proposal.

This is just a work session so I don't think you need to decide now. But just think about any issues that you want us to give you options for maybe in the next session. So deliberations are scheduled for the 19th from 9:30 to 10:15. And the 2023 petitions and all the supporting staff report and documents can be found at skagitcounty.net/2023cpa.

Chair Wesen: Commissioner Browning, any other comments, questions?

Commissioner Browning: No, thank you. It was really good. I'm glad that you made it clear that the Fully Contained Communities were not included because we're still getting emails about that, where that became a – anyway. But thank you. This is very complete and I appreciate it.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Chair Wesen: Commissioner Janicki?

Commissioner Janicki: On that 23-6, the Manufactured Homes, you know, I'm aware of one situation where a family, you know, an adult child moved into a manufactured home on the family farm property and then, you know, one of the parents passed and the other one needs to move into a different care situation. And, you know, they've been there long enough – it's hard to see us get rid of housing in a time where housing is so critical. I guess so maybe my question really is: With our expanded use and size of ADUs, if it possible that there's a way to set up a unit that it would be an ADU where an adult child would live taking care of parents still in the family farmhouse versus having to remove a home that is connected to septic water. It might be more of a permanent ____.

Ms. Ruether: Yeah, it might be a Jack question too, because that sounds like it. But I think you can reapply for it, you know? If it's a care situation you are definitely eligible for it. Their concern is when it's *not* a care situation anymore that then you're just – you're saying something's grandfathered in when it's not. But I would say that if it's a care situation you're still meeting the intent of the code and requirements for it.

Commissioner Janicki: Because the ADUs are allowed on the Ag-NRL –

Chair Wesen: They are, but there're some strict requirements. You should be using the same driveway and the utilities should be coming through the same way. We don't want to have 40 acres and an ADU on each end, each corner of the property. So there are some distance that they're trying to get at. Robby, did you have something to comment?

Robby Eckroth: That's actually one of the points I was going to make. And then, of course, with the new House bill that just got passed – I believe it was last year – we're going to have to modify some of those requirements when we go through the next Comp Plan update. So some of the barriers that we currently have, such as the siting criteria, will likely be modified in the coming years to make it a little easier ____.

Commissioner Janicki: The distance to the other – I mean, is it size and distance that's going to be modified, or –

Mr. Eckroth: Well, we already meet the size requirements.

Commissioner Janicki: Okay.

Mr. Eckroth: But yeah, I believe that there are certain siting requirements that we might have to modify, and then there's also – I believe you can't have landscaping requirements and some other things that can make it a little bit more difficult that we'll likely have to remove. I don't know all of the ADU requirements in Skagit County off the top of my head, as I haven't worked with them here, but I do know that we'll have to modify some of them.

Commissioner Janicki: Okay. I just think it's – and it's probably outside the purview of this particular work session, but it's something that, you know, the title notice makes sure that we or a buyer knows that a modular unit would have to be removed. But I'd like to get ahead of that and say, What can we do or how can your new housing unit going in be permanent, you know, within the confines of the law? Because that's really hard to see something that's going to be jerked out once it's in place.

Mr. Eckroth: And I will say I think I've seen, as a department, if we have someone who's interested in pursuing the temporary manufactured home and they qualify for an ADU, we will steer them that way if it seems like they'll qualify, just so they don't have to go through some of the requirements to remove it later on.

Commissioner Janicki: Okay.

Chair Wesen: Some of these have been in for 20 or 30 years.

Commissioner Janicki: Yeah.

Chair Wesen: And that's the other issue that we're coming up on.

Commissioner Janicki: Yep. And then for the sake of one of our guests here, the Countywide Planning Policies Update under 23-10 that is the final decision on the Boundary Review Board. I know there's quite a bit of conversation and some information has been requested by a member of the public. And so I just want – I want to be able to have that conversation not today but about the actual functionality and some of the concerns that have been raised. So I can certainly work with staff on that outside of this session.

Chair Wesen: So it was unanimous on all the docketing items except the two from the Planning Commission?

Ms. Ruether: Right. It was just the OSRSI and the Guemes Saltwater Intrusion.

Chair Wesen: It sounds like the Commissioners want to deal with that in the future, so we'll talk about that.

Ms. Ruether: Okay. Okay.

Chair Wesen: Some more modifications to it.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Chair Wesen: Because both of those were put to the Planning Commission –

Ms. Ruether: Right.

Chair Wesen: – the second or third time already.

Ms. Ruether: Oh, okay.

Commissioner Browning: The well water one also, right?

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Commissioner Browning: Okay. Perfect.

Chair Wesen: Is there anything else?

Ms. Ruether: No, that's it.

Chair Wesen: I want to thank you very much for being at Skagit County. I'm sorry to see that you are going to move on but thank you very much for all your time and effort here.

Ms. Ruether: Thank you.

Commissioner Browning: But actually you're going to –

Ms. Ruether: I'll be in Skagit County. I'll just be back to transportation planning. I'll be at SCOG.

Commissioner Browning: You're going to be doing trails and outdoor and –

Ms. Ruether: *Maybe*. I don't know!

Commissioner Browning: Non-motorized –

Ms. Ruether: I mean, SCOG does work with Brian on that, so yeah.

Commissioner Browning: Yeah, because there was some – at least some interest that you were going to take on some of the non-motorized stuff, and I hope that's the case because we've kind of been weak on that for some time, and it *really* is such a huge part of Skagit County – which meshes nicely with some of this stuff today.

Ms. Ruether: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Browning: Good. Fantastic.

Chair Wesen: So if there's nothing else, definitely appreciate – Commissioner Janicki had another meeting she had to run off to and Jack had something he had to go to also. So with that, we are going to adjourn...so with that, we're adjourned. Thank you very much (gavel).