

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**Public Hearing: Permanent Regulations on Marijuana Facilities**  
**June 16, 2015**

**Public**

**Commenters:**

**Sharyn Sowell**  
**Lori Scott**  
**Roger Mitchell**  
**Delinda Baughn**  
**Andrea Harrison**  
**John Boisen**  
**Joan Schleh**  
**Scott Serles**  
**Kathy Mitchell**  
**Russell Sowell**  
**Barb Hendrickson**  
**Larry Hurlimann**  
**Bev Mohr**  
**Armin Mohr**  
**Heather Wolf, Bernard Finney/Cedardale, LLC**  
**Joel Martin**  
**Annie Lohman**  
**Carol Ehlers**  
**Connie Munsey**

Sharyn Sowell: I'm Sharyn Sowell, 14922 Valley View Drive in Mount Vernon. I want to thank the Commissioners and the Planning Commission for all of your hard work. It's been much appreciated.

I support everything that the Planning Commissioners recommended. I think we can agree – or many of us can agree – that marijuana growth, processing, and sales do not belong in any residential area or near schools, daycare facilities, parks, hospitals, or nursing homes. I think that because greenhouses cannot be secured and there are issues such as lighting and odor that cannot be controlled in them, I request that you restrict marijuana growth and processing to opaque structures only – no greenhouses countywide – and that you permit marijuana growth and processing in industrial zones only. That seems where it's appropriate and safe.

I support the special use permit process and the notification of residential neighbors. I would request you consider notifying residential neighbors within 1000 feet. I support that you require special use permits to include the consideration of impacting on surrounding properties such as residences, school, daycares, public parks, and so forth – that you require things like hazardous substances, waste disposal. I really appreciate all of the things that Dale Pernula mentioned today about what must be considered. We support prohibiting hazardous chemical processing in all zones except Bayview Ridge Heavy Industrial.

I request that you don't allow greenhouses anywhere in the county. It just seems most straightforward not to allow them even in Bayview Ridge, and that you completely prohibit collaborative gardens. We've seen that the medical needs a lot more control than what might

happen. And then I further ask that you allow medical marijuana to be grown inside a residence, and limit the size of greenhouses to 8 by 10 or smaller so that we don't end up with large, large supposable medical grows that really are more industrial. Thank you.

Lori Scott: My name is Lori Scott. I live at 3351 Old Highway 99 North in Burlington. And I also want to thank the Commissioners and the Planning Commission for the incredible amount of time and work they've put into this as well. We know how many issues there are surrounding this.

As you draft permanent regulations, I'd like you to consider the following comments:

First of all, I support the recommendations of the Planning Commission and, in general, I feel like their review was extremely thorough, and personally I would oppose any outdoor production of marijuana in Skagit County. It shouldn't be allowed at all.

I oppose marijuana production and processing in any residential area and support the recommendation to allow it only in industrial zones and only by those licensed by the Liquor Control Board or their new entity.

I support special use permits on applications for marijuana production and processing and notification of neighbors within 1000 feet of the property line of any facility that applies for a permit, and that comments by neighbors be considered as part of the special use permitting process.

I oppose the use of translucent structures – greenhouses – to produce or process marijuana anywhere in Skagit County. I just don't – I think it should be opaque.

I oppose medical marijuana cooperatives in Skagit County. Medical marijuana production and processing, which is allowed by Washington State for those who have a valid prescription, should only be allowed in personal residences for the personal consumption of the patient with a prescription. No hazardous chemicals such as butane should be permitted for medical marijuana processing by individuals. And the storage and growth of plants should not be seen or readily smelled from any other property.

I oppose marijuana sales anywhere other than in Rural Freeway Services or by Administrative review in Rural Center, Rural Business, and Urban Reserve Commercial.

All marijuana facilities of any type should be fully licensed and in good standing with Washington State Liquor Control Board, and marijuana facilities should be expected to allow access by authorities at any time to verify that legal and safety requirements are being met.

And then, finally, I would suggest that any facility permitted prior to the final regulations must be required to meet all the requirements of these final regulations within a reasonable period of time, and if a property was previously permitted and is sold to new owners that the new owners must meet the requirements of the final regulations. Thank you.

Roger Mitchell: Good morning. I appreciate that the County is taking sufficient time to try to get this ordinance right. I also thank the Planning Commission for an excellent job and I strongly concur with the recommendations in their recorded motion.

Specific points:

Notification to neighbors: It makes a big difference whether you measure from the property line or the facility. It should be from the property line. It should be 1000 feet. The table up here shows you the difference between 300 feet or 1000 feet in terms of the number of surrounding properties that would be notified. The red ones are 14 additional properties that would be notified if you measured from the property line rather than the facility.

Special use permits: The highest level of regulatory rigor should be applied to every marijuana facility proposal.

Marijuana is industrial; it is not agricultural. All marijuana production and processing facilities should be in Heavy Industrial zones only.

Marijuana facilities should be prohibited in all natural resource zones. Marijuana is not a natural resource. Current Skagit County Code and the Comprehensive Plan adequately address acceptable and non-acceptable activities in natural resource zones.

Marijuana facilities do not belong in residential neighborhoods or near areas where kids and families congregate.

Prohibit marijuana greenhouses in all zones. Marijuana production and growth should be prohibited outdoors countywide and otherwise restricted to opaque structures from which light, noise, and odors cannot escape.

Public safety: Use of potentially flammable and explosive hazardous chemicals should be prohibited at all marijuana facilities with the exception of facilities permitted in Heavy Industrial zones.

Water: Growing and processing marijuana takes copious amounts of water. As long as Skagit citizens are not allowed to use water from their own water wells or irrigate their crops or build a house on their own property because of water restrictions, then we cannot let marijuana facilities use inordinate amounts of water.

Recreational marijuana and medical marijuana are completely separate issues. Marijuana cooperatives should be prohibited countywide.

And lastly, customer use of marijuana in any form at or adjacent to marijuana retail, production, or processing facilities should be expressly prohibited. Thank you.

Delinda Baughn: Hi. I'm Delinda Baughn. I live at 17153 Dunbar Road in Mount Vernon. Thank you. You pronounced my name perfectly. That's usually not done. I hope to be very brief but I want you to understand that my brevity does not reflect my passion.

I'd like to thank the Planning Commission for their three-hour-plus meeting. It was very apparent at that meeting that they had done their research, put a lot of time and thought into the matter, and came at this with hard work and diligence. I'd like to express to the County Commissioners – I'd like to ask you to adopt their proposed plan, as it's a very comprehensive plan. And if you can't adopt it as-is. I'd like you to make it more restrictive. In going around and talking to community members, I realize there's a lot of apathy in our community and people don't understand maybe the importance of adopting a plan that's extremely comprehensive without lots of loopholes. The major concern I came across was enforcement: Well, it doesn't really

matter because it won't be enforced anyway. So my answer to that is please be sure that you fund the cost of enforcement so we have a plan in place, we have rules, we have consequences, we have boundaries, and they're then enforced. Thank you all very much for your time.

Andrea Harrison: Hello. My name's Andrea Harrison. I live at 224 Alderson Place in Burlington. I'm also a volunteer for the Brigid Collins Public Policy Education Committee. It's part of a social service agency whose mission is to support the healthy development of children and families in our community. That's why I'm here today.

So as all of you know, the Board of County Commissioners has prepared a final proposal for permanent regulations governing recreational marijuana facilities here in Skagit. Although the County Code echoes many state regulations, we don't believe it fully protects children and teens as it does not contain language prohibiting marijuana retail establishments from advertising to children and youth. Our committee is especially concerned about this issue because research shows many kids in Skagit County already think marijuana use is safe and easy to get. So I asked some kids in our community what they thought, and here's what some of them had to say:

"Marijuana's a plant, which means it's natural. How harmful could it be?"

"Would you rather I drink alcohol? Weed is so much safer."

"My parents smoked weed back in the day. I don't see what the big deal is."

Last year almost 40% of 10<sup>th</sup> graders in Skagit County thought there was little or no risk of using marijuana regularly, compared to 26% of 8<sup>th</sup> graders and 23% of 6<sup>th</sup> graders. In addition, almost 60% of 8<sup>th</sup> graders in Skagit County believed marijuana was easy or very easy to get.

Research also shows that everyone is influenced by advertising. Oftentimes the most sought-after group is kids because they're more easily influenced and brand loyalty can be established at an earlier age. This leaves the potential for significant childhood exposure to marketing of an alluring, newly legal drug that contains the net communication that it's okay for kids to use marijuana.

Washington state law is very specific about the location of recreational marijuana retail outlets and their distance relative to sensitive entities. Permanent regulations proposed by the Skagit County Board of Commissioners mirrors these exact statutes.

They also prohibit marijuana advertising and labels sold in the state of Washington to contain any statement or illustration that depicts a minor, toys, or cartoon characters, or any other depiction appealing to children or minors.

Although regulations proposed by the Board limits the number of signage, there is no regulation as to what the signs contain or illustrate. As a result, this gives recreational marijuana retail establishments in Skagit County the option to gear their advertisements to children and minors.

So it's very important that kids and teens are not drawn to establishments here in the county. As such, the Brigid Collins Public Policy Education Committee has a recommendation. We suggest Skagit County include the same language enacted by the state that prohibits recreational

marijuana retailers advertising towards youth and encourages you to adopt the exact language into your permanent regulations. Thanks.

John Boisen: Hi, I'm John Boisen, 14857 Dunbar Lane. I just want to say that living next to a marijuana facility – production facility – for the last number of months that this really is an industrial facility use. It's 24/7, 365 days a year, all hours of the day, and I think that it should be prohibited except for in industrial sites. Thank you.

Joan Schleh: I'm Joan Schleh. I live at 17198 Dunbar Road, Mount Vernon. First of all I want to say that I do agree with those who have gone before me, and what they say so I won't be redundant and go over those again. I would like to say I live across the street from the Dunbar grow operation. It was a year ago that we first met our neighbors at a local auction in the neighborhood where they told us and assured us they were going to be good neighbors and grow bonsai trees or something to that effect. And it was in August when I made the first phone call to the Liquor Control Board saying, I don't think they're growing bonsais in there. I think there's something else going on. And we were assured that they did not have a license through them. So thus started a long process with our neighbors where we introduced ourselves to you, and you're probably rather tired of us at this point. But all along we kept saying the same thing – there is a place for legal marijuana in our state. It is *not* on our streets. It is *not* in our residences. The fact that they are required to have the cameras means that they are going to pick up my daughter as she goes jogging every day up and down my road. That's not right. And because they're so close to neighbors there's no way that their cameras can *not* pick that up. And so the setbacks are very important in that situation.

The fact that they are in greenhouses – Skagit is full of greenhouses. Do we want to see them all turned into marijuana grow operations? No. That's where we grow flowers and berries and landscaping plants. That's not appropriate for marijuana. And so they absolutely need to be in opaque structures in an area that is removed from neighborhoods. And it's in front of this one facility where a bus stop is. We've said that's not good. We've said that's dangerous. And, sure enough, last Thursday the police arrived. The police in technical gear arrived. They stripped the place. There was all this activity going on. They had to come with dump trucks to take it all away. We said from the beginning this is what's going to happen. Just because they say, Oh, we're medical, doesn't mean that's what was happening inside. You have to have a way to enforce and to check. Just because they say, Oh, we're just private. Oh, we're just doing it for ourselves, doesn't mean that's really what's going on. We knew what was going on and that's why we're here, and I so appreciate the work that your department has done in listening to us and trying to keep our neighborhood safe. Thank you very much.

Scott Serles: Hello. My name is Scott Serles. I'm from 18729 Fir Island Road in Mount Vernon, and I'm here today to address the concerns that the Board has put together.

My biggest concern is the immediate shutdown of the medical facilities. As this system gets rolled into one, I think the state has done a pretty good job at this point with, you know, combining the system and trying to make a good regulated system. But there's a huge gap right now of the products available for those medical patients. And I'm talking about specifically CBD products. For those of you who don't know, I actually am involved in the industry on both sides – in medical and in retail. I do own a retail facility. Some of you may have seen it was actually mentioned here. We are the only permitted facility in the Skagit County – down in 221.

We sat here with these guys and we had a planning meeting letting them know exactly what our intention was when we came into Skagit County, and that was to provide good medicine for

people in need. I've got people coming to my facility in wheelchairs. It'd be very hard for those people to grow their own medicine. One of my patients drives in. He's a paraplegic, paralyzed from the neck down. He drives his wheelchair into my store with his chin to get CBD capsules and to get CBD medicine so he could sleep at night not having muscle spasms. These are products I can't even get on the recreational side right now. I can go up and down the state. I cannot find a producer that has these capsules. So for me, I don't have a way to fill his need.

So that's my biggest concern with all this as this comes together. I am all for regulation of this industry. We want to make it legitimate. We want to see a way for people to be able to get help, and so that's my biggest concern. I understand the County's and the Commissioners' and your guys' concern about having it in residential areas. You know, for full-scale production – no, I don't believe that's the right place.

Another one of my concerns that I see here is marijuana cooperatives in all zones not being – being prohibited in Skagit County. Once again, I think that would limit people who are in wheelchairs and not able to grow it themselves. That – when they have to set up a cooperative, they have to go through the structure and let the Board know where their facility is. For you guys to think that people are just going to stop growing marijuana tomorrow in the residential houses, it's not going to happen. So it's still going to happen. It'd be good, obviously, for these places to be notified, you know, where they are.

So that's my biggest concern at this time. I appreciate you listening to my concerns.

Kathy Mitchell: Good morning, Commissioners, and good morning, staff. Thank you for all the work that you've done so far. I've sent my comments in over the weekend. I'm sure you've gotten those. I'll just hit a couple of highlights off those so we don't get too redundant.

But I do believe that as we move forward what we're going to find is just like any other business, like the Liquor Control Board has found with liquor places in the past, (as) we move forward with the medical marijuana thing or recreational marijuana thing. The people that are going to follow the rules and the laws are going to follow the rules and laws. That's the way people tend to be. The ones that are going to try to skirt the system and scam the system are the ones that are going to be problems. Therefore – I know this is something that you already know and everybody realizes, but this is why I think it's very important within the code that we can have for the county is to make sure that we really hammer out the code for specifics, both in requirements for – in the requirements section and the special use sections. So please be very diligent with the language on there so that the County does have some teeth for code that they can enforce some of the local issues.

I do believe that the 1000-foot notification notice is pretty important. That's entirely different from a land use issue. That is just a notification issue. And when you get into the rural areas, that can make a big difference on the number of property owners, whether they are residential or business, that can be notified and are aware of something that goes on. In our own neighborhood, it turns out that there's a facility now and it may make a difference down the road. I have no idea on how that place is operating now. I can't say that I do because I don't. But the people in the area should know what's going on and know what the laws are and what they can do. So please pay attention to those things for details.

The other thing: Within the special use criteria the state has listed the places that are adjacent to where minors may be and they've had that specific list. I please encourage you to add nursing homes and hospitals to those lists, the reason being is that there's many places that

minors congregate with families. Nursing homes and hospitals are key places where the kids are and will be, as minors. Everybody knows that the adults can make their own decisions. They children cannot. They're very impressionable. And so at this time that's one of those things that we really should be controlling and watching.

Again, there's many details that is listed out and the things – I really concur with what the Planning Commission had done. I do applaud the staff. They've done a lot of good things. Dale Pernula's report on the 21<sup>st</sup> incorporates a lot of points that I've mentioned that I also think were really pretty good. So please refer to those comments. Thank you.

Russell Sowell: Good morning. My name is Russell Sowell. I live at 14922 Valley View Drive in Mount Vernon and I'm here to say that I support and thank the Planning Commission for all their work. Thank you, County Commissioners, for your work in this, and I ask you to adopt the Planning Commission's recommendation on this and I ask you also to prohibit collective medical grows in our area. Thank you.

Barb Hendrickson: I'm Barb Hendrickson and I have my short speech. You've heard enough of me probably this time. The rest of my comments are going to be sent in. My name is Barb Hendrickson and I live at 17289 Dunbar Road in west Mount Vernon.

When I moved into my home 44 years ago, that area was already an established neighborhood. And when several of us appeared before the Commissioners in December of 2014 we presented our concerns of how a marijuana grow business had changed the face of that neighborhood. We asked that marijuana production and processing *not* be included in the residential areas. We've now reached that point that over time others have reached the same conclusions. In addition to not permitting growing, processing, and selling of marijuana in residential areas, I fully support the restriction of marijuana growing and processing to only opaque structures located in industrial areas. I'm very thankful that all of us have had the chance to express our concerns and that hopefully our rollercoaster ride might somehow smooth out a little bit with some of this permanent ordinances adoption.

However, there is one caution that I've expressed on my other previous occasions. None of these intended regulations will have any meaning if there's no enforcement or accountability. All of us have spent way too much time for these words not to have any meaning, so please think about that. Thank you.

Larry Hurlimann: My name is Larry Hurlimann and I live at 3401 Old Highway 99 North in Alger in the Alger community. I wanted to begin by thanking and extending my appreciation to the County Commissioners, Planning Commission members, Planning Department, and all County staff that have worked so diligently on the development of proposed permanent regulations for marijuana facilities. I wanted to comment on permanent regulations from two perspectives.

The first perspective: As a private property owner that shares a property line with a state-licensed Tier 3 recreational marijuana producer and processor and, secondly, as a present and potentially future resident of this county. Since original concerns have been raised by myself and other neighbors of marijuana facilities in the county, many changes have occurred. The County has created multiple interim ordinances and now we are approaching implementation of permanent regulations. The County has addressed concerns of odors, video surveillance of neighboring properties, setbacks of marijuana facilities from neighboring residents, and many other concerns.

One issue that directly impacts our community that has not been addressed is grandfathering in of marijuana facilities in operation prior to the implementation of permanent regulations. I request permanent regulations include details that prevent existing marijuana facilities from being grandfathered in and all permanent regulations apply to marijuana facilities already in operation. If the marijuana facility on my neighboring property is allowed to be grandfathered in, it would most likely be the only outdoor marijuana production facility in the county. For us in our community that have worked so hard with the County and have participated in the process of developing permanent regulations, we now find ourselves in a situation that is worse off than when we started the process. Many of our original concerns would still exist and we would be the only community in the county that would still have to deal with them. I request that regardless of how the County's grandfathering process has been dealt with in the past that the County consider a unique approach for the process when dealing with marijuana facilities in the county.

Next I would like to discuss permanent regulations of marijuana facilities from the perspective of a Skagit County resident. Since this past July, myself and others have been thrown head first into the Washington State's social experiment with recreational marijuana. As an unwilling participant in Washington State's social experiment, I request that Skagit County legislators conduct their own social experiment. As part of the experiment, I propose Skagit County legislators implement more restrictive regulations on marijuana facilities than other nearby counties. With regulations implemented, various data could be compared to those nearby counties: local school test scores, unemployment rates, criminal activity, and assessed property values. This is the type of experiment I would willingly participate in.

When considering the potential tax revenue from marijuana facilities in the county, costs must also be considered. I have personally observed that the County has invested numerous County employee hours to deal with one single violation of our neighboring property. The potential for more time and money invested by the County could potentially increase with more marijuana facilities in the county and more violations. Regardless of which permanent regulations for marijuana facilities are implemented, they will have a significant impact on the future of Skagit County and should be considered carefully. Thank you.

Bev Mohr: I'm Beverly Mohr. I live at 17140 Dunbar Road, Mount Vernon, and I thank my neighbors for their diligent work in all this preparation and I certainly support the Planning Commission and what they have to propose. Thank you.

Armin Mohr: My name is Armin Mohr, 17140 Dunbar Road, Mount Vernon. When we moved into our neighborhood in 1970, it was a very happy, cheerful neighborhood and across the street there was a place that grew beautiful ornamental plants. The next thing I knew, a year or two ago we woke up with a big, black fence. This building was no longer growing ornamentals but we found it to be marijuana. And I just wanted to support my neighbors who are very passionate about this. It's our feeling that marijuana is not to be grown in a residential property and that it should be reserved only for industrial areas. And I appreciate what I'm hearing, what the Planning Commission has recommended, and I recommend that that would be adopted. Thank you.

Heather Wolf: Heather Wolf, Brownlie Evans Wolf & Lee. I represent Bernard Finney who owns and operates a marijuana facility along Cedardale Road in the Ag-NRL zone.

We support and appreciate that the regs allow marijuana facilities in opaque structures in the Ag-NRL zone. But the proposed permanent marijuana regulations contain two problematic



provisions: the 400-foot setback and the special use permit requirement for opaque structures in the Ag-NRL zone. Staff has done a very good job of explaining why a 400-foot setback should not be adopted. The crucial point is that there's no justification for this setback. Rather, it appears to be an arbitrary distance. A 400-foot setback would make it impossible for Mr. Finney to operate on his property, despite the property being otherwise perfectly suited for a marijuana facility. Although there is a residence within 400 feet of Mr. Finney's property and his opaque structure, it is not otherwise located near a residential neighborhood. The property is surrounded by a large potato field and any impacts from the marijuana facility will be contained within the existing opaque structure. No rationale has been articulated for such a large setback at the numerous meetings on this issue. We urge you to support staff's position in regard to this issue and not impose a new setback requirement.

Next, requiring an Administrative Special Use Permit for an indoor marijuana facility is unnecessary and overly burdensome. The proposed regulations already address impacts such as odor, lighting, and camera placement. Through these regulations, staff will have the ability to condition any building or occupancy permit to further address these impacts. The special use approval criteria are redundant and they only serve to create an unnecessary burden on staff and the applicant. A likely result of requiring a special use permit is that neighboring property owners will falsely believe that they can stop a marijuana facility due to generalized concerns about marijuana policies. A better approach would be to simply include these requirements to address lighting impacts, waste disposal, screening, processing methods, and any other impacts in Section 3 of your proposed regulations. And these are the requirements for all marijuana facilities. The special use permit is costly and time-consuming for both applicants and the staff and fails to serve any real purpose in terms of public benefit. We therefore urge you to remove the 400-foot setback requirement and the special use requirement for indoor recreational marijuana facilities in the Ag-NRL zone. Thank you.

Joel Martin: Good morning, folks. My name is Joel Martin and I'm co-owner of 221, 18729 Fir Island Road in Conway. Thanks for the opportunity for giving us, you know, a place to talk and to express our concerns.

One of my concerns is, you know, shutting down the current collective gardens. Basically what you're going to do is feed and make the black market grow stronger. We've actually witnessed this, being both on the retail side and on the medical side. It's been noted that dissolving any collective gardens or anything like that you're going to feed the black market. You're going to feed those folks who have been doing this for the past 40 years behind closed doors. You guys haven't even known about it. It's already been there, already existed. Now that it's in the forefront, everybody's up in arms, and I understand. I don't want a huge grow facility in *my* residential neighborhood. And I have a retail shop so I have – there's things I have concerns with, too. You know, a transparent greenhouse – I don't agree with that. Opaque, I do. And the 400-foot setback – yeah, that's extreme. That's just basically making it so someone can't run a business. Skagit County is known for its agricultural uses. I can assure you, as a business owner, we've had a lot of people come through our shop very encouraged, very happy that we are there and giving them the opportunity to come through and also spend money in your guys' county.

So we're real happy to have the opportunity to be here, but I just want you guys to know that just – it's a slippery slope. We just want you to be aware that there is a black market and it will just get stronger if you put more regulations on folks who just want to take care of themselves. So I appreciate your time. Thank you.

Annie Lohman: Hi, I'm Annie Lohman, 15283 Sunset Road, Bow, Washington. It's actually near Edison. And I'm also on the Planning Commission but I'm speaking for myself.

I do like the separate chapter for marijuana, but I suggest that you change the name back to what you had earlier where you called it the Marijuana Production, Processing, and Retail Facilities. Now in the current suggestion you have it called Marijuana Facilities, but that is not in your list of definitions. So I want to make sure that you're collecting all of the activities involved in marijuana under that chapter.

The Planning Commission laboriously went over the zoning – different zoning – and for the large part we suggested using Administrative Special Use for retail, with the exception of the Urban Reserve Commercial-Industrial area. And the reason for doing that was because the maps that the County relies on are not definitive. It takes going out and visiting a site. It takes gathering additional information that is not on that map. And a great illustration of that is the maps that were included on the website that GIS did. If you look on panel number 5 where it shows Bow Hill Road and Chuckanut, it doesn't list Peter Pan Preschool yet it suggests that in that Rural Center or the Rural Businesses there that you could have a retail outfit. Well, you can't because you haven't put everything on the map. So without a public process you can't find these things out. And staff doesn't know everything and the maps are not perfect. They're a starting point but they're not the end-all.

On the special use permits, the items that you have listed for item number 4 and item number 5 on page 4 of your attachment 1, these are the criteria for the special use permit. If you're not going to require special use permits, why don't you add them to the criteria for the general requirements for the marijuana facilities? Because unless you have a special use permit, those things drop off. They're not included in the regulation for the marijuana facility.

In the Rural Business, it was pointed out that you already have a special use permit criteria, so why not add the marijuana-specific language to that chapter?

The Rural Resource and the Ag-NRL: It has the same water issues that Guemes Island has, same pollution issues that Guemes Island has. Guemes Island does not have the exclusive water and pollution concerns. Our whole county has that concern, as you can tell now with the drought.

Medical marijuana: The challenge is the growing and the production side so I suggest if you want to include medical marijuana that you have the same restrictions for production for medical marijuana.

And the Liquor Control Board considers a domicile as your property, so it could include all your outbuildings. It's not your house. And that was all.

Carol Ehlers: Is this yours, Annie? Somebody left something. Carol Ehlers, west Fidalgo Island. I agree particularly with Lori, Roger, and Annie, so I vote for what they've said in the details they've given it, which means you can't make a decision today. You have to do some thinking.

I want to commend the County – you Commissioners, the staff, and the public for one of the best public processes I've seen in 35 years. You started assuming that marijuana was agriculture and you have changed your position to say – to *recognize* that it's industrial. That's a *huge* change in every way I can think of, because when it was agriculture you were going to spot-zone an intrusive use into residential, agriculture, city, town – every place that you could

reach. You changed your mind on that, and the last thing that the staff did was say that it should be specifically added that this is not an agricultural use. The importance of that is because of a County Code, 14.38, the Right to Manage Resource Lands. Required by state law to have a half-mile, Skagit County decided there was going to be a full mile. Then it decided that this law was not going to just protect spot zones in resource lands, which is what it was intended for, but resource spot zones in *residential* lands like in my neighborhood. So if you were unfortunate enough to have a spot zone like the people in Alger and the people in – particularly in Alger when it's distinctly zoned residential. Well, you could go to hell because you had no right under 14.38 to object to anything. You couldn't object to smell, you couldn't object to noise, you couldn't object to any single thing that happened. And you've changed that. That's huge. Thank you.

Now it's correct your maps are not accurate because you have no tradition of proofreading them. I've come before you again and again with maps that need proofreading. The latest one is the public access map for the shoreline. Oh, what a disaster. You didn't do it. You hired somebody to do it, but nobody proofread it. So you are about to completely misrepresent jurisdiction. It's the usual thing that happens when you try to do something and then you think staff knows everything or that government agency up there knows everything and we don't have to double-check. Please change your practice and double-check these maps.

Connie Munsey: Good morning. Connie Munsey from Anacortes. I hate to follow Carol because oftentimes we think alike so much. But the first people I'd like to thank are the citizens who have stood up for their property rights and they did not back down. This process – as soon as I-502 was passed by the voters our cities and towns and throughout the state of Washington, for the most part everybody started the process: How are we going to deal with this? Not Skagit County. We have professionals. They just ignored this. It was the volunteer citizens who got this ball rolling. It was the volunteer Planning Commission – everyone understands these people come and they have these horrendously long, detailed meetings. They are brilliant folks. They represent us. And they have come up with a comprehensive – a very good plan. Then we've got – and I also want to thank Commissioner Dahlstedt for immediately jumping on this – he said, This is a serious problem – and fast-tracking this. Because since I've been watching property rights in this county this is the fastest process I've seen and it's brilliant. If we can continue – this is a new wind of cooperation between the citizens and the people we have elected. Please keep it coming. It's very welcome. Thank you.