

**Skagit County Planning Commission**  
**Updates: Comp Plan Survey; PC Schedule; 2024 Docket**  
**July 9, 2024**

**Planning**

**Commissioners:** Kathy Mitchell, District 1 (absent)  
Vince Henley, District 1  
Angela Day, District 1  
Amy Hughes, District 2  
Tim Raschko, Chair, District 2  
Joe Woodmansee, District 2  
Tammy Candler, Vice Chair, District 3 (absent)  
Martha Rose, District 3  
Jen Hutchison, District 3 (via Zoom)

**PDS Staff:** Jack Moore, Director  
Robby Eckroth, Senior Planner  
Tara Satushek, Senior Planner

**Public**  
**Commenters:** Nancy Shimeall

Chair Tim Raschko: (gavel) Good evening. Welcome to the July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2024, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission. We are missing tonight Commissioners Candler and Mitchell, and Commissioner Hutchison is on Zoom. Good evening. We can see you there!

Okay, we need to go through some minutes, first from June 11<sup>th</sup>. I'd welcome a motion to approve the –

Commissioner Vince Henley: I move that we approve the minutes for June 11<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Angela Day: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded. Is there discussion of the June 11<sup>th</sup> minutes?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Well, then all in favor of approving the minutes, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: We have the June 18<sup>th</sup> minutes. Is there a motion to approve this?

Commissioner Henley: I move that we approve the June 18<sup>th</sup> minutes.

Commissioner Day: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to approve the June 18<sup>th</sup> minutes. Discussion of the minutes?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All those in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

Commissioner Jen Hutchison: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Did you say "aye"? Okay.

Commissioner Hutchison: Yes.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. And we have minutes from June 25<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Henley: I move that we approve the June 25<sup>th</sup> minutes.

Commissioner Day: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to approve the June 25<sup>th</sup> minutes. Any changes or discussion?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: If not, all those in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Commissioner Hutchison: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Okay, that's – all the minutes are approved. We have Public Remarks tonight. This is a time on the agenda for an opportunity for anyone to speak to the Planning Commission about any topic except items scheduled on the agenda for a public hearing the same day or items that have had a public hearing and are still under Planning Commission deliberation. Public Remarks, which is not part of the formal public participation process for any development regulation or Comprehensive Plan amendment project, is limited to three minutes per speaker.

So is there anybody who wishes to address? Please go ahead – at the podium, please, and before you begin, please state your name and address.

Nancy Shimeall: Do I need to speak into one? No? Well, thank you. My name's Nancy Shimeall. I've written my comments down so I stay on topic. I live on Swinomish land near La Conner and I also own an 80-acre forest above the Skagit River in east Skagit County. Both of these locations provide different but alarming evidence of the need for our county to not only plan for climate resilience but also mitigation, but also to act urgently to reduce our emissions and pollution. These are two sides of the same issue: the need to prepare for the oncoming loss of predictable weather

events, and to stop contributing to the human causes of these emerging threats to our way of life in this amazing valley.

On Swinomish land where I live now, the land and the water – we live with impacts such as king tides and more frequent flooding; loss of salmon and forage fish due to habitat loss; warming water; and toxic runoff. Across the valley, sea level rise and saltwater intrusion are impacting our farmland. This will impact our food. And in the forests of east county, we are losing trees due to drought and wildfire. As someone trying to sustainably manage my forest, I fear for my trees because across the state we are experiencing die-off due to excessive heat and drought. There are a growing number of us county residents who are deeply concerned about the potential of what lies in our shared future if we do not act urgently. Our previous comp plans had few direct actions around measuring and reducing greenhouse gases and preparing our community for the future impacts of our changing climate.

Now the update to our 2025 Comprehensive Plan presents a great opportunity to collaborate with the many knowledgeable and concerned groups ready and anxious to participate in the process. Since it is early in the process, I have one request today. More will follow. Please create a climate advisory group that includes nonprofits in the valley, such as Skagit Citizens Climate Education and the Skagit Valley Clean Energy Alliance, who are excellent resources for reducing greenhouse gases. The scientists from the Skagit Climate Science Consortium should also be included because they can provide scientific factual information about what Skagit County will experience in the not too distant future.

Again, I'm one of a growing number of county residents *deeply* concerned about our changing climate and what we stand to lose of the things we love about this amazing valley. Please know many of us are ready and willing and anxious to participate. Thank you again.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Is there anybody on Zoom who would like to?

Tara Satushek: If you'd like to speak on Zoom, can you please raise your hand? That'd be by selecting the "Reactions" icon.

(silence)

Ms. Satushek: It doesn't appear that anybody wishes to speak by Zoom.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. That'll close the Public Remarks. So we have a Comprehensive Plan Survey Results Update. That'd be Ms. Satushek.

Ms. Satushek: Good evening. I am going to present the results from our first survey from our Community Visioning Survey. If it's okay with the Chair and Commission, I would request that questions be placed at the end, just to help with the flow of the presentation.

So from April 9<sup>th</sup> to May 15<sup>th</sup> the County conducted a five-week, online public survey to gather feedback from the community. The survey was anonymous and was seven questions. It was widely advertised across Skagit County's networks, both online and in person, to encourage maximum community participation. This included social media and using the Department's

listserv. Also other agencies reshared the survey as well, including Skagit Land Trust and Community Action.

So the survey is one of many tools that was used and is being used for the public outreach process to help with the visioning that's required by the state. "Visioning" means a process of citizen involvement to determine values and ideals for the future of a community and to transform those values and ideals into manageable and feasible community goals, as defined by WAC Chapter 365. The intent of the survey was to gauge the community's perception of Skagit County's strengths and weaknesses and identify key areas of focus for this update project, as well as initiating dialogue that the project was at the data collection envisioning phase. These were the goals that the project team identified that we wish to get from doing the survey. Again, identifying the greatest strengths and weaknesses, identifying broad priorities, using it to advertise the start of a year-long project, and data collection for emails to help with interested residents to build a network for future input.

So question 1 was a force ranking of eight multiple choice questions where participants were ranked – were asked to rank in priority what they felt best described the county. There were 717 participants with the survey. 710 answered this question. The top-ranking one was Family Oriented and the second one was Stewardship of Natural Resources. And I'm sorry – the text is a little small so I'll read it. So it's in order of priority that was identified by the survey was number one, Family-Oriented; number two, Stewardship of Natural Resources; three, Health and Safety; four, Prosperity and Opportunity; five, Diversity and Community Inclusion; six, Community Cohesiveness; seven, Financial Stability; and eight, Equity.

Questions 2 and 3 asked participants to pick two from the following list of what their perception of Skagit County's greatest strengths and weaknesses are, in addition to providing a write-in option. These are as listed.

Here are the results and it should – hopefully your packet's a little easier to read than this slide. But for question number 2 – What are the greatest strengths? – the number one was Rural Character, and the second one being Environmental Stewardship.

For the greatest weaknesses, folks identified Housing Supply and Affordability as being the greatest weakness and the second one being Transportation Options. So bike, bussing, transit, multimodal transportation that's outside of a single-occupancy vehicle.

There were write-in options for both of these questions. The one that came to the top – and, again, there is a draft Community Survey that was included in the packet there and is also available on the Planning Commission website. It's in draft form and we will have it finalized by the end of July, but a lot of the write-in answers are in the appendix of that document. But for the greatest strength that was a write-in was agricultural and – excuse me, was farming and agricultural \_\_\_ strength. For question three – What are the greatest weaknesses? – the greatest weakness that was written in was the Increase in unhooded populations.

Question four asked, and it stated: "Skagit County is aiming to establish a vision to guide the Comprehensive Plan for the county for the next 20 years. We want to know what is most important to you. What priorities do you feel are the most important to focus on over the next 20 years? And please rank your priorities." And this was also a forced-rank multiple choice where six options were given, and this was the results. Number one being preservation of agricultural land; two, housing supply and affordability; three, environmental preservation; four, economic growth and jobs; five, community resilience and hazard mitigation; and six, transportation improvements.

Questions five through seven were just getting demographic data. What the respondent was in relation to Skagit County; if they're a resident; if they worked here; if they were a student; and also the age of the survey respondents and where they lived.

The project team decided to go with the geographic regions to capture the west, central, and east county so that's what this map is trying to demonstrate. Again, most population being in section A, which is Mount Vernon, Burlington, Anacortes.

These were the general findings by region, and there's a lot of information here but I'm going to read a few things.

Results were further analyzed by the region respondents where they lived to identify local differences in survey responses. It was generally found that regardless of where area respondents live, they listed the priorities similar in order of the survey results. All three regions listed preserving agricultural land as the top priority. All three regions listed economic growth and jobs as their fourth priority. Region A listed environmental preservation as their second, so second to the ag land – preservation of agricultural land – as the highest of the three. Respondents B did – from – excuse me, Region B, was improving housing supply and affordability. And Region C, the second to the agricultural land preservation, was community resilience and hazard mitigation.

The results are further contrasted by age and what was interesting with this is that regardless of the age of the respondents the top three were all similar. So number one being the preservation of agricultural land; number two, housing supply and affordability; three, environmental preservation; and the last one again being transportation improvements. But where the differences were was for economic growth and jobs was a more of a – greater concern for the 18 to 44 responses than 45 to 76 were. The concern was community resilience and hazard mitigation. And then the inverse with the following category.

What was interesting is that no one under 18 participated in the survey or self-identified participated in the survey. I thought it'd be – I think that's an area where we want to focus on, I would imagine. When I was in high school, we had a civics class and so making those connections. Granted that folks under 18 can't vote, but they still should have an input into the future of this area.

Here's a nice graphic that our consultants provided, so I don't want to take credit for this. But we had 717 respondents. 304 folks signed up to receive updates on the project; and then a breakdown of the demographics of where they lived – excuse me. If they live in Skagit County, own property, worked, operated a business, and such.

Most of the respondents were from Region A, which, again, was where most of the cities were. We did reach out to our Communications Manager and did a geofencing boost for Regions B and C, but still did not get a lot of response back, so we would like to know how we can better engage with those folks. We did an open house and a lot of people were happy that we were able to be there to go out to Concrete. But again, it was difficult with this method – again, this being one of many tools to get public input. And the majority of folks, too, worked in Region A.

The majority of respondents were between ages 65 and 74, and not so much response from 18 to 24.

So how will we use this information? As noted at the beginning of this presentation, this is one of many strategies used for public input engagement. The project team aimed to understand the community's vision, goals, and priorities through this feedback. This will continue with discussion with interested community organizations, stakeholder interviews, written comments submitted, conversation with the public at tabling events, and then again such as today, having public testimony or public remarks and receiving public comment.

So we highly encourage everybody to keep track of the project by this website here. This is updated with – they'll be – have upcoming events that we'll be tabling at in the future. It will have – once we have our final draft of the public engagement summary will be there as well. We are requesting that folks, if they have any comments, to provide written comments to [pdscomments@co.skagit.wa.us](mailto:pdscomments@co.skagit.wa.us). We also recommend if – for folks to go to this website and at the bottom of it you can sign up for project updates and join the listserv, and it's specific only to the project so you folks won't get spammed with anything else. It's just related to the Comp Plan Update. The project schedule is also available and it shows where we plan to be and where we're at. And right now we're in this phase here, the Spring/Summer of 2024 – the Data Collection and Analysis and Visioning Survey released. The Visioning Survey is tentatively planned to be released before the end of the month. And I'm going to see if this hyperlink will work...and this was one of the – this has been presented to the Planning Commission already but just for folks that are online or that. This is available through that webpage as well. So, for example, you could see the month and then see where we're at. So June we had open houses. Here we'll be having – the next Planning Commission will have a presentation by our consultants on one of the plan elements.

And this is my information. I'm sorry I didn't introduce myself earlier. I'm Tara Satushek, Senior Planner, one of the two planners working on this project. And again, we strongly urge folks to participate. And if there's any questions, I'd love to answer them.

Chair Raschko: Are there any questions?

Commissioner Day: I'll ask a question.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Commissioner Day: Thank you again for your presentation. I thought the presentation of the data and breaking down the geographic area and the demographics of respondents was really helpful and really interesting. I'm just wondering: How does the vision and goals question in particular – how will that be incorporated into the planning process?

Ms. Satushek: That is a very good question. And I would also like to reach out to my colleague Robby, if he has any input. But it helps us get a filter of what it is that we think – so we look at the data and this is what we're seeing. But then we're hearing folks – like at the open houses – sharing. These are concerns that we had. So, like, one of the ones that I have heard at every tabling event has been daycares, that there's not enough childcare. So how do we use that as, like, a filter to help with the goals and policies for this process? But that's my understanding of how we intend to use this information. Is there anything else, Robby, you'd like to add?

Robby Eckroth: Yeah, I'd just say – Robby Eckroth, also Senior Planner with Skagit County Planning and Development Services. This is a very high level survey, and I think as we get further and further in the process we're going to get really more into the details. So this just gave us an

idea of what the community's priorities are and we've gotten more specific details from our open houses, like Tara mentioned. That was a great explanation.

Chair Raschko: Anybody else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: I have a question on Question 1. The list goes from family-oriented to stewardship and natural resources, health, and safety. But the bottom one is equity, and I just wonder if you could define that or elaborate on it a little bit, please?

Ms. Satushek: Yeah, so equity was chosen because it was one of the goals that is identified in the County's Strategic Plan that the County wishes to implement, if I remember that correctly. And so the way we use the term "equity" is – the definition we used here – and, again, this is open to interpretation – but for our lens we're using it as meaning everyone is provided with resources specific to their needs to be successful, as opposed to "equality," where everyone is treated the exact way regardless of the person's needs or individual preference – excuse me, individual differences. So my understanding of "equity" in this case is realizing that there are folks (who) may have different needs or different struggles that may need to – excuse me – we might need to meet them where they're at as opposed to just giving everybody the same level playing field. I don't know if you've seen this graphic, but it's, like, these kids looking over a baseball field and they're all – like one's tall, medium, and short, and they're all given, like, a two-foot riser. And so, like, that's the – like the visual of equality. Where equity would be, like, the shorter kid would get the taller riser so they all had this equal access to the game. I don't know if that makes sense or not. But it's more of a wagger approach – folks realizing, like, for example, equity in this context with public engagement, you know, we went to the Concrete Community Resources Fair. Where that's not typically something that this project – comp plans – would do, but we're trying to meet people where they're at, given that they might have transportation constraints. Again, we went to the farmworkers events hosted by the County a few weeks ago with translators, knowing that there might be a communication gap there. Translation services available at the open houses. So that's, I believe, one of the examples we're using as equity, to make sure everybody has an opportunity to provide their input with this project.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, thank you. Was that presented in the questionnaire in such a way that the respondents would understand that? Or did it finish last because everybody just shrugged their shoulders, you know?!

Ms. Satushek: Yes, this was, I think, just a good – this one was a very open-ended question and it was to – it was open-ended but also forced ranking, in the sense that these were what were identified. And we relied heavily on our public engagement consultant because we don't have that expertise currently inhouse. And working with other comprehensive plans, we kind of did a survey of, What are other jurisdictions looking at to solicit input or what community values are, or what best describes their community? And so that's how these were selected. But again, as I mentioned before this, I think hindsight's 20/20 and there's definitely ways I would have liked to finetune this now looking back. But I think this was just one example of just starting the conversation. Like, What is equity, and how does Skagit County promote equity? And so I think that was the intent of Question 1, is mostly to get that conversation started, not to necessarily quantify it. But again, it was one of many strategies used just to start the conversation.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Henley?

Commissioner Henley: Yeah, I think there's very often confusion between the concept of equal opportunity and equity. In my way of thinking, "equity" means where you provide a benefit to someone who really doesn't deserve it. All right? So that means you actually force a structure on, you know, whatever you're trying to manage. And I would suggest that you make that very clear about that difference between equal opportunity and equity, because equity is – it's something like free lunch, but I wouldn't quite describe it that way. But it is very different than equal opportunity. But I think when you were describing it you did get it confused with equal opportunity. I don't know – have I got that wrong?

Ms. Satushek: Again, equity – we use it because it was a value listed in the Strategic Plan. And I hesitate to talk too much to it in the sense that I don't know how it's – it was, just again, to start conversation, but as far as equity, the County is looking into what their newest Strategic Plan Update of County operations – and Jack, please let me know if I'm way out off left-field. They are looking at implementing and looking into diversity, equity, and inclusion into the Strategic Plan. So once that is finalized, I would love to come back with a better answer.

Commissioner Henley: Is that something basically that has to do with the way contracts are allocated, for example?

Ms. Satushek: That I do not know.

Commissioner Henley: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Anybody else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Hutchison, do you have anything?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: I take that's no.

Commissioner Henley: She shook her head no.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. So nobody else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, thank you very much –

Ms. Satushek: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: – for the presentation. And we'll move on to the Planning Commission's Scheduled Update. Mr. Eckroth.

Mr. Eckroth: I just realized I forgot my notes over there. Great. Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Robby Eckroth. I'm a Senior Planner with Skagit County Planning and Development Services. I just wanted to give you a brief update on the schedule. This is a little bit more refined from the last time I provided this to you. As you can see, starting next meeting we're going to start reviewing the Comprehensive Plan elements within packages. So we're going to be doing about



two to three per meeting. And this is just the first of many meetings to discuss each element. So we're going to be providing you with drafts for you and the community to provide feedback, and we should have public comment open for about a month for each element. And then from there we'll just continue refining.

As you can see, we're really going to be focusing in on the Comprehensive Plan Update over the next few months and then when there's meetings available starting in September, we'll have time to go over the 2024 Docket and then also the Capital Facilities Plan Update for the next six years. And, yeah, I'm open for any questions or any feedback, but I just wanted to give you that quick update just so you know what the rest of 2024 looks like.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Joe Woodmansee: The schedule that we have here says August 13<sup>th</sup> for a meeting, which is Saturday – coming up.

Mr. Eckroth: August 13<sup>th</sup> is a Tuesday.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Is it? Oh, yeah. I'm sorry. You're right. I'm in the wrong month. Scratch that!

(laughter)

Chair Raschko: Anything else, Joe?

Commissioner Woodmansee: No.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Commissioner Day: I don't see anything about agritourism.

Mr. Eckroth: Agritourism is probably going to need to wait until next year – Jack, unless – do you have anything else to add?

Director Jack Moore: Well, sure, \_\_\_. We're working on it right now, trying to figure out what the best schedule's going to be and what the first steps will be in that remand. So yeah, we haven't quite worked that out with the Board of County Commissioners and so we'll be updating you as soon as we get that in-hand.

Commissioner Day: Okay, thank you. I understand this is a very full schedule and that's a big task, but I'm sure folks are interested in when that will come back to the surface for more discussion. So thank you.

Director Moore: Very much so. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Henley?

Commissioner Henley: A quick question. Which way is the wind leaning? Is it leaning towards agritourism or against it? I'm just curious.

Director Moore: Well, I was going to ask the Planning Commission that! You're the ears and eyes of the community and it's been remanded back to you. So certainly staff will help provide options and information as you see fit. I'm sure the – you know, the Ag Board for one will have a lot of input. Other community members will have a lot of input. And we'll have ample opportunity to discuss some of the specific items that the County Commissioners indicated they would like to have more information and recommendations on.

Commissioner Henley: One of the key sticking points always seemed to be the grandfathering of, you know, already existing operations, and that seems to be a particularly tough nut to crack.

Director Moore: Yes. Now that one has mostly been answered by the Board of County Commissioners and then further refined by an Administrative Official Interpretation that I issued

–

Commissioner Henley: Okay.

Director Moore: – sometime back. And I'm starting to engage with different operators right now on documenting their existing use and helping guide them toward code compliance if they so choose. So I do anticipate there will be – you know, I don't know how many operators will fall under that moratorium guidance and the AOI, but I'm guessing somewhere in the 15 to 20-ish range or so –

Commissioner Henley: Okay.

Director Moore: – if I had to guess right now. I'm refining a broad list of event venues and other ag accessory type uses right now, and we will be contacting all of them just in case we don't fully understand their business operation, so to encourage them to participate if they think this applies to them.

Commissioner Henley: Very good. Thank you. I appreciate the insight.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Woodmansee: So I realize that we've addressed the grandfathering question, which the big L in the room – right? – is that. Is it possible that when this comes back to us we still would address that in some way, do you think? I mean, I guess we always have the option to make a recommendation but –

Director Moore: Certainly you could. I'm not sure what that would look like as the Commissioners have given guidance already, and the AOI's been issued. It is final now and they're moving forward. That's not to say that the Board of County Commissioners couldn't choose to change direction at some point. But right now that is the solution they have put forth for these existing operators.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So it would be fair to say that we're not – at this point we won't expect that portion of this to get back in front of us in this remand.

Director Moore: Not directly. Yeah, hmm. I'm trying to think if there would be any aspect of the existing operations that would. I mean, I do think there are dozens and dozens and dozens of other operations that aren't as large as what was the focus of the ordinance and the moratorium that was put in place. That, you know, that – I could easily see that being part of the discussion,

you know? What do we do with the rest of everyone else? Is there a place for them, these smaller operations out there that may not quite fit? You know, I could easily see us discussing that. But I do believe the very focused – the focus of the Commissioners' action were those venues. And like I said, they're probably in the – I'm guessing 15 to 20 operators. I think the Commissioners have taken action on that and I'm uncertain whether they see it going differently in the future.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, short of a normal \_\_\_ we didn't see this. We need to address this. I really appreciate the fact that you're looking at reaching out because I feel like the County should make every effort to make sure that somebody that may have their head in the sand wakes up and understands, you know, the direction that's out there now.

Director Moore: Absolutely, yes. It definitely is a limited time opportunity that the Board of County Commissioners have presented these operators, so I do want them to take advantage if they so choose. And it would be difficult were they to come in at a later date.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Is there anything else on our current agenda item, Planning Commission Schedule Update?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, thank you. We'll move on to the 2024 Planning Docket Update. Mr. Eckroth again, please.

Mr. Eckroth: Thank you, Commissioners. So this is just a brief presentation to introduce the 2024 docket of proposed policy, code, and map amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, following the Board of County Commissioners establishing the 2024 docket on May 13<sup>th</sup>.

So this presentation will summarize which petitions were placed on the docket, the annual Comprehensive Plan Update process, and the 2024 docket schedule for the rest of the year.

So just to quickly summarize: The Comprehensive Plan amendment process is an annual process where citizens and County staff can submit petitions to make changes to the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations. The annual docket process is a separate process from the 2025 Comprehensive Plan update.

As you can see on the screen, we are on step 2, which is Department and Planning Commission Review. We are still in the policy-writing stage so I won't be discussing any policy or development regulation amendments or staff recommendations. Since we have already discussed the proposed petitions, I won't be going into detail on each petition at this time and will just be summarizing which petitions were included on the docket, since I never got a chance to do that following that May 13<sup>th</sup> meeting.

At the end of this presentation, I will show the 2024 Planning Docket Schedule, which includes specific dates. And the petitions and supporting documents can be found at [www.skagitcounty.net/2024cpa](http://www.skagitcounty.net/2024cpa).

So on May 13<sup>th</sup> the Board of County Commissioners established the 2024 Planning docket by resolution. Of the four citizen petitions, three were included in the docket and one was excluded. All four County petitions were included in this year's docket. And just a reminder: A decision to

docket a petition by the Board does not constitute final action. It just means that the petition will get additional analysis from Department staff and the Planning Commission.

LR24-03, which is the SMV LLC Rural Freeway Rezone, was the one petition that was excluded from the docket. This petition requests to rezone two parcels totaling approximately 4.87 acres from Agricultural-NRL to Rural Freeway Service. The Department recommended that the petition be excluded from the docket as the Growth Management Act rarely allows counties to grant type 1 Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development, or new Type 1 LAMIRDs, and the petition is not consistent with the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan Policies.

LR24-01 was the one citizen rezone that was included on the docket. The rezone petition was submitted by Washington State Parks and requests a rezone of approximately 77.85 acres from Rural Reserve to Public Open Space of Regional/Statewide Importance. The property was recently incorporated into the Deception Pass State Park.

There were two citizen petitions included in this year's docket requesting proposed amendments to the development code. The first petition is LR24-02, which was submitted by John Bouslog. The petition would amend the Bayview Ridge Light Industrial zone by reducing buffering requirements and by amending the landscaping requirements between industrial and residential lands on Bayview Ridge. Staff is still working with the applicant to develop code language which will be presented to the Planning Commission at the next work session.

LR24-04 was submitted by the Port of Skagit and would update the Airport Environs Overlay to improve awareness of the Skagit Regional Airport by requiring a title disclosure. And the amendment would also update the Airport Environs Overlay compatibility requirements, which includes amendments to the exhaust plumes and electrical interference standards to be compatible with the current FAA guidance.

Four County petitions were included in this year's docket. The first is C24-1, which would update the Countywide Planning Policies, recommended by the Skagit County Council of Governments Steering Committee, which would disband the Skagit County Boundary Review Board.

C24-2 is the proposed creation of a new section of Skagit County Code which would regulate fencing. And the new section would prohibit razor fencing and barbed wire fencing in certain zones that primarily single-family residences.

And then C24-3 would remove a use in the zoning code allowing storage of unlicensed and/or inoperable vehicles from all zones except the Urban Reserve Commercial-Industrial zone.

And then last, C24-4, is a general code language cleanup, which includes two amendments. The first is a correction to the height limit restriction in the Guemes Island Overlay in Skagit County Code 14.16.360(7)(b)(i) to only apply to proposed development in the flood hazard areas. And currently it could be read to apply to the entire island.

A correction – the second minor amendment was a correction to eliminate duplicate language in the CaRD land division section in Skagit County Code 14.18.300(1) through (4).

So here are the next steps of the docketing process. As you all know, we have a pretty tight schedule as we're going to begin working on the 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update. So we've fit some time into our schedule. We'll have two work sessions on December 10<sup>th</sup> and October 8<sup>th</sup>,

and we'll hold a public hearing November 5<sup>th</sup> and then hold deliberations to make a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners on November 19<sup>th</sup>.

Thank you for your time, Commissioners. That's all I have at the moment, and I'm available for any questions.

Chair Raschko: Are there questions? Commissioner Hutchison, have you any questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Nope? Okay. Great.

Commissioner Hutchison: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, we're all good? Okay. Well, thank you.

Mr. Eckroth: Thank you, Commissioners.

Chair Raschko: Well, that takes us to Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements. Since you're up there, Jen, would you like to go first?

Commissioner Hutchison: I have no comments this evening. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Amy?

Commissioner Amy Hughes: Nothing to add.

Chair Raschko: Angela?

Commissioner Day: No. Thank you, everyone.

Chair Raschko: Vince?

Commissioner Henley: Nothing.

Chair Raschko: Joe?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Nothing.

Commissioner Martha Rose: No, nothing.

Chair Raschko: Nothing. Okay, well, thank you very much and I appreciate everybody's time this evening, and we'll stand adjourned (gavel).