

**Skagit County Planning Commission
Deliberations: Capital Facilities Plan
Deliberations: 2023 Docket
November 28, 2023**

Planning

Commissioners: Kathy Mitchell
Vince Henley
Amy Hughes
Tim Raschko, Chair
Joe Woodmansee
Tammy Candler Vice Chair
Martha Rose
Jen Hutchison (via Zoom)

Staff: Jack Moore, Planning Director
Sarah Ruether, Senior Planner
Robby Eckroth, Senior Planner

Chair Tim Raschko: (gavel) Good evening and welcome to the November 28th, 2023, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission. We have everybody here, one of us remotely. That's Commissioner Hutchison. And I'd take a motion to approve the minutes of our last meeting, please.

Commissioner Vince Henley: I move that we approve the minutes from the last meeting.

Commissioner Kathy Mitchell: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes.

Vice Chair Tammy Candler: I have one –

Chair Raschko: Is there discussion? Yes?

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah, I – it could have just been me and the time I was trying, but I could not access our minutes from the website. So I just wanted to point that out. I didn't read them because I wasn't able to. It didn't open when I clicked on it.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Sarah Ruether: I don't know. Were they in your email?

Vice Chair Candler: I was looking through the website.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: And they were on the agenda area items for today and I couldn't in that way. It could have just been me but I don't know.

Ms. Ruether: Yeah, and Robby did – I was on vacation the week of Thanksgiving but Robby did – the wrong agenda got posted too.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay.

Ms. Ruether: I will check that.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Henley: They were available by email.

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah, I just didn't get a chance.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so there's no problem with the minutes?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All those in favor of approving the minutes, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: All opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And Jen approved. So tonight we have time for Public Remarks again. And there's – well, okay. This is a time on the agenda – is an opportunity for anybody to speak to the Planning Commission about any topic except for the two things on our agenda tonight, which are the Capital Facilities Plan Update and Deliberations on the Docket. So this is not a part of the formal record. But you can say anything you wish. You have three minutes. And please start by saying your name and address. Do you wish to speak?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Nobody. Is there anybody online?

Robby Eckroth: There is not.

Chair Raschko: Do we have anybody online?

Mr. Eckroth: Just Jen – Commissioner Hutchison.

Chair Raschko: All right. Well, Public Remarks is closed. So we'll move to our first major item here, which is Deliberations on the Draft Capital Facilities Plan Update. Is there anything from staff before we begin?

Mr. Eckroth: Good evening, Commissioners. Robby Eckroth, senior planner for Skagit County Planning and Development Services. So tonight we're going to have deliberations for the Capital Facilities Plan and Transportation Improvement Plan, and I just wanted to note that the public comment period ended on November 16th and we received no public comments. So I just want to put that in the record. I have given you all a draft recorded motion for you all to look at. It's very

similar to last year's with changed dates. And I am here for any questions or comments you may have. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Are there any questions?

Vice Chair Candler: I have a motion.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Candler: Well, are we at deliberations now?

Chair Raschko: Well, deliberations are open.

Vice Chair Candler: I'm going to move that the Planning Commission recommend the Board of County Commissioners approve the Capital Facilities Plan as amended.

Commissioner Mitchell: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to approve the draft Capital Facilities Plan Update as presented. Is there discussion?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: If not, then all of –

Commissioner Henley: I have a comment.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Commissioner Henley: It's a lengthy and comprehensive plan. It's complicated. And this is one instance when I'm willing to accept the good work that the staff does in providing the best outcome for the county. So I support it.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Anybody else?

(silence)

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

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And abstentions? None. So that passes. Thank you. So we'll move on to Deliberations on the 2023 Docket.

Ms. Ruether: Good evening. I'm Sarah Ruether, senior planner, and tonight we're going to have deliberations for the 2023 Docket. Just to let everyone know, the docket item C23-7, Flow Sensitive Basin Rules, was rescinded. There're some additional technical changes that need to

be made to the petition by Natural Resources so it will be brought forward next year for consideration. I also want to note that 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.

And then just for review where we are at the process: We are – the list of petitions was established by the Board. We had the public hearing to establish that. And we had our work sessions. We had, I think, like, three work sessions. We had SEPA and Commerce review. We had the comment period and we presented the comments in November 14th. And we had a public hearing. I had the public hearing and presented the comments after that, and tonight the Planning Commission will make their recommendations. And then the next step is a work session with the Board of County Commissioners December 4th from 1 to 2 p.m. And all of the staff reports and supporting documents can be found at www.skagitcounty.net-2023cpa.

Are there any questions before we proceed?

Chair Raschko: Is there anything?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Chair Raschko: And we shall begin. I think it would be appropriate for me to go through each element and after it is finished to do the Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action immediately after. Ms. Ruether, does that sound all right?

Ms. Ruether: Mm-hmm.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so we'll start with LR23-01, the Dunlap Rural Reserve Rezone. This proposal seeks to rezone approximately 21 acres, a portion of five parcels, from Agricultural Natural Resource Land to Rural Reserve. So the floor is open.

Vice Chair Candler: I have a motion.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Vice Chair Candler: I move that the Planning Commission recommend that the Board of County Commissioners adopt the zoning map amendment to rezone the Dunlap property from – or the portion, the appropriate portion, of the Dunlap property from Ag –

Commissioner Mitchell: Second.

Vice Chair Candler: – to Rural Reserve.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to do that. Did you get that motion down? Do we need to restate it?

Vice Chair Candler: Maybe.

Chair Raschko: Is there discussion?

Commissioner Mitchell: The motion person first.

Vice Chair Candler: Based on the reasons cited herein, but also in the proposed recorded motion, but also just in general, it looked to be an area that was probably not appropriate for farming, which is the point of the ag land – or Ag-NRL. That was my reasoning.

Commissioner Mitchell: I concur with what Commissioner Candler said. This looks like it's pretty much straightforward and I do think we should approve it.

Chair Raschko: Other comments?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, all those in favor of the motion, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed? Oh, wait a minute. Before we do that, we need the Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action. But we can't do that until we've acted.

Vice Chair Candler: No, I know. I just think we should open it up for if anybody wants to add any findings or remove any. I think we should have that ability.

Chair Raschko: Absolutely.

Commissioner Amy Hughes: Can we have what findings – are we starting? Yeah. Could we have ____ on the screen?

Chair Raschko: Is that possible?

Ms. Ruether: Sorry, I'm _____.

Vice Chair Candler: Can we have this on the screen?

Ms. Ruether: Sure, sure.

Commissioner Mitchell: Sarah, will you be wordsmithing with us?

Ms. Ruether: Yes, I will.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Ruether: Let me put that up. Here we go – can you see that?

Vice Chair Candler: No, not yet.

Commissioner Henley: Not yet. There we go.

Chair Raschko: It just went away.

Ms. Ruether: It went away?

Chair Raschko: Okay, do we need to read these out loud for the record? Okay.

The parcels in question are a result of an error in designation as the properties are not farmable and do not consist of commercially significant soils.

Secondly, WAC 365-190-040(7) allow for overlapping designations if the overlapping designations are not inconsistent or incompatible with each other.

Thirdly, there is precedent for agricultural land being zoned along the toe of the hill in Skagit County just south of this proposed project.

And fourth, the parcels can be rezoned from Ag-NRL because these parcels are an upland slope, which is not suitable for farming activities. The petitioners delineated the farmable areas to remain in Ag-NRL designation.

Vice Chair Candler: I have a question.

Chair Raschko: Please.

Vice Chair Candler: When we, in our Recommendation Number 1, do we need to distinguish the whole Dunlap property from just that? Because it's bigger.

Ms. Ruether: Right. It's just along the toe of the hill. I did do a table. It's 21 acres is the part that is not – which is not farmable. So we could do a Finding of Fact _____.

Vice Chair Candler: Could we just add "Rezone the appropriate portion of Dunlap property" in that sentence?

Ms. Ruether: Which one is this?

Vice Chair Candler: This is the second sentence after number 1, right after "rezone." Up at the ____.

Chair Raschko: Second line down.

Ms. Ruether: Oh, okay. Oh, oh, oh, oh – rezone the 21 acres. Okay Sure. Is that better?

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you. Because I just – I think it's a bigger –

Ms. Ruether: It is. I think the total is, like, 68 or something, but 21 is – it's just the non-farmable.

Vice Chair Candler: I just wanted to distinguish somehow, but that works. Thank you.

Ms. Ruether: Totally.

Chair Raschko: If you wanted to be real specific, the lot numbers are –

Vice Chair Candler: No, I just wanted to distinguish it from the whole property. I think this does it. I don't know. What do you think?

Commissioner Mitchell: It looks fine.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay.

Chair Raschko: All right. Anything else for Findings of Fact? Joe?

Commissioner Joe Woodmansee: Just to carry on that conversation, I think that they submitted detailed exhibits of what they wanted to rezone and not, so we could reference their exhibit if we're trying to find the area.

Vice Chair Candler: We could add the word – you know – “requested.”

Commissioner Woodmansee: I mean, I'm – in my mind, we're approving what they requested.

Vice Chair Candler: Right.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Literally.

Vice Chair Candler: So do you think this language is adequate?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I actually think we get there, but if you want it to be more specific you could add – you know, reference their submittal. But the last one gets us there because it talks about them delineating the farmable areas. I think we get there either way.

Ms. Ruether: Delineate the 21 acres?

Vice Chair Candler: I would have used the 21 just because maybe there's 21.2.

Commissioner Woodmansee: What if we put “the specified 21 acres”?

Chair Raschko: You know, just putting the parcels number in makes it very specific.

Ms. Ruether: Sure, I can insert that in. I have it right here.

Commissioner Henley: There ought to be a survey that designates the property specifically. So you can just refer to that.

Commissioner Woodmansee: That might not be done yet.

(Commissioners commenting among themselves – inaudible)

Vice Chair Candler: I don't think it works to do the parcel numbers.

Ms. Ruether: You don't want to do the parcel numbers? Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: Because I think there's overlap, if I'm reading it right.

Commissioner Woodmansee: We're dissecting parcels.

Vice Chair Candler: Exactly, so we can't ____ the parcel ____. I think if we just say “the requested” or specified approximately 21 acres, at least they'll know we're not – maybe I'm just being –

Commissioner Mitchell: That should cover it because there's enough maps and information that says _____.

Vice Chair Candler: I'm still talking about up in number 1 up here. I'm not talking about where you're at.

Ms. Ruether: Oh, no no. This is a different one? Okay. I'm in the wrong spot. Sorry.

Vice Chair Candler: That's okay. I'm asking to just clarify just the recommendation itself.

Ms. Ruether: Oh, for number 1? The number 1, okay.

Vice Chair Candler: The "specified approximately 21." Just add the word "specified" before "approximately." Thank you. Yes.

Commissioner Woodmansee: You could say "A portion of the Dunlap property _____."

Ms. Ruether: "A specified portion"? Is that better?

Vice Chair Candler: Yes.

Commissioner Mitchell: That's fine.

Vice Chair Candler: That's good. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, is everybody satisfied with the way this is written?

Commissioner Hughes: I'd like to add one.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead, please.

Commissioner Hughes: And this came from your report so maybe you're going to –

Ms. Ruether: I'll just add it right here. I probably will take it back and then stick it in the thing because I'm not as fast a typer as Jenn is.

Commissioner Hughes: I like to always remember the process has been historically set for us, and so there was a statemen. The 1997 Skagit County Comprehensive Plan stated agriculture lands more specifically were to be designated based on existing farming activity and presence of prime farmland soils. They had mentioned that it was never farmed up in that area and it wasn't prime soils, and I think that that's an important part of this rezone.

Ms. Ruether: Okay. So "The 1997 Comprehensive Plan stated that this area had never been farmed"?

Commissioner Hughes: How about "stated agricultural lands were to be designated based on existing farming activity and presence of prime farmland soils"? And then if someone has the words to conclude that taking it to this parcel – but I just felt it was important to highlight that fact.

Vice Chair Candler: By just adding the sentence that this is not historically farmed or something, right?

Commissioner Hughes: Yeah. Whatever would make sense to put a conclusion on that. I'm asking for help.

Vice Chair Candler: I think another sentence, Sarah, that just says historically this portion of the parcel was not farmed.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: Is that accurate, you think?

Chair Raschko: All right. Anything else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, all those in favor or approving the Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: It passes. So we will move on to LR23-03, Bayview Ridge Light Industrial Rezone. The floor is open.

Commissioner Mitchell: Chair, I want to make a motion.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Commissioner Mitchell: I move that we approve the zoning map amendment to rezone the Port of Skagit property from Bayview Ridge Residential to Bayview Ridge Light Industrial.

Commissioner Martha Rose: Second.

Chair Raschko: it's been moved and seconded to essentially approve LR23-03. Is there a discussion?

Commissioner Mitchell: I could just say that the information was presented well and thoroughly, and it's not normal for a parcel to be split in two. So that should have been fixed and this is an appropriate fix.

Commissioner Rose: I have a comment.

Chair Raschko: Please.

Commissioner Rose: So the objections that were raised made me – it appeared that there was a lack of understanding about what that would mean for them. In reality, that one-acre parcel

would end up mostly being buffer, and so the objections of the adjoining property owners, I think have been mitigated – *well* mitigated – by the fact that most of it is buffer. 100 feet of it.

Commissioner Mitchell: Do you think you'd like to put that in the Findings of Fact?

Commissioner Rose: Yeah, probably.

Chair Raschko: Other comments?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, all those in favor of the motion, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: So that carries. We'll turn to Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action. First, the property requested for a rezone currently has a split zoning designation between Bayview Ridge Light Industrial and Bayview Ridge Residential. The rezone request is consistent with the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan and the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan because the rezone would ensure the entire parcel is suitable for industrial development.

Secondly, the parcel lies within the Airport Environment (sic) Overlay and the proposed industrial uses would be more appropriate in the AEO, and existing development regulations ensure there will be a buffer between industrial activities and the adjacent residential neighborhood.

And third, the parcel proposed to be rezoned was erroneously mapped and zoned with a split zoning. This rezone would correct this unintended error.

Have we discussion about the Findings of Fact?

Vice Chair Candler: They look good to me.

Commissioner Mitchell: They look good, barring if Martha wants to add.

Chair Raschko: Martha, would you like to –

Commissioner Rose: I think it could be added under B just by maybe saying that the proposed buffer will be adequate mitigation, or something like that – "will address the" – "will mitigate the concerns that the adjacent property owners voiced," or something like that.

Vice Chair Candler: We can't see here what you're typing, Sarah.

Ms. Ruether: I don't know how to do that. Can you guys put it back on a screen? Is it something that I do?

Commissioner Mitchell: There we go.

Chair Raschko: There you go. We don't have it.

Ms. Ruether: Okay, do you –

Commissioner Rose: Well, we had it for a second.

(off-mic incomprehensible voice)

Ms. Ruether: Oh, okay. Okay. Do you want me to add the sentence-to-be or do you want it to be separate?

Commissioner Rose: I'm sorry – what?

Ms. Ruether: For the proposed buffer.

Commissioner Henley: We don't have it here.

Ms. Ruether: Oh, you can't see it? Oh.

Commissioner Rose: Oh, here it comes back. "To address the neighboring properties' concerns."

Commissioner Henley: You know, an acre's not much of a buffer.

Ms. Ruether: A hundred-foot buffer is what's proposed. We could also specify that that's the buffer.

Commissioner Rose: The rezone's only an acre, isn't it?

Ms. Ruether: Yeah, the rezone's only an acre but the buffer itself will be 100 feet between the residential and the industrial.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, I don't know that we're guaranteeing there's going to be 100 feet. I mean, codes could change and things could change but Martha's point is that it's adequate mitigation.

Ms. Ruether: Okay. Right, right.

Chair Raschko: Vince, are you satisfied?

Commissioner Henley: Sure, yeah. I mean, I still don't think it's a very big buffer but if it's 100 feet that's easily within an acre, so...

Chair Raschko: Okay, is there anything else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All right, all those in favor of approving the – what is it? – the LR23-03 Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Thank you. So we could move on to C23-1, Seawater Intrusion Area Well-Drilling Requirements.

Vice Chair Candler: I have a motion.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Vice Chair Candler: I'm going to move that the Planning Commission recommend the Board of County Commissioners to *not* adopt the Seawater Intrusion Area amendment.

Commissioner Henley: I second.

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's been moved and seconded to recommend non-adoption. Discussion? Do you have anything?

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah, I do. I know this isn't an easy one and I definitely think this is an important issue. I don't want to be misunderstood but...there's a couple of things. I think what they're requesting in this petition is *really* burdensome for a person to locate location depth and chloride levels of surrounding wells. I'm not even sure where that information exists, how a person would get it. And I – that's one thing. Another thing is that we are moving into an area that has traditionally been a state – completely managed by the state, and I don't know that we're in a position to bring that on. And I understand that the County's idea about this would just be sort of information only but I am concerned about expansion of that or of people not really knowing what it means to have to get this approval. I don't know how that would look and I'm concerned about that.

When I asked, you know, the Department about senior water rights, the County Department I think appropriately said that that's not really their purview and that's not really what they do. That's Ecology. And I just think that if we're going to – we're putting our foot half in. I don't even know what we're doing with this. It doesn't make sense to me given the system to make such a small piece of the county different from statewide. And so that's my reason.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes, I concur with what Commissioner Candler said and could add a whole lot more. But to try to keep it simple, there's no reason for us – the County; the royal "us" – to come in between what the DOE does. I went back and read the statutes and such for Washington water rights and state's rights. Under chapter 90-54, RCW Water Resources Act of 1971, it gives clearly to the Department of DOE the purview for all this, no more or no less. And for us to come through because somebody wants to throw another hurdle to prevent people from using their property or for building or for watering their cattle or whatever it's going to be is not right because the Department of Ecology already handles those situations. It would be something that does not fix what they're saying they want it to fix anyway. All the studies and such back up the same information. I could go on ad nauseum about it but in lieu of doing that, the basic line is this: We should not be coming between the DOE and people's rights to go to the DOE to get water. And that's what this would do.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I concur with both Commissioners. I think I spoke up in a previous meeting. I don't want to add a second step. You know, when I read this, this actually is saying that the County can literally deny the permit, which it was one of my big concerns when we talked about this at the study session on this. And I think that the DOE is clearly recognized as the authority in this area and I think it maybe a little bit would be inconsistent for the County to argue for water rights as long as they've had them. We spend so much money trying to get people to drill wells and then pass something that gives the County the right to say no. I think that's inconsistent. And so for those reasons and exactly what was already stated, I would support this motion.

Chair Raschko: Anybody else?

Commissioner Henley: Well, in the last meeting I made the comment that I thought that this was a solution in search of a problem, and I don't think we need to do it and I don't think we need to move outside the boundaries of the authority of the County. I think this is Ecology from start to finish and that's where it ought to remain.

Chair Raschko: I have just a brief comment. I came across this today. I thought it was interesting. But I know that the flow-sensitive basin rules is out for tonight, but still in the summary describing it it says this petition would amend SCC 14.24.353 (70) to remove language in the critical areas ordinance which refers to flow-sensitive basins. The current language refers to limits on groundwater withdrawals in flow-sensitive basins; however, these regulations have been superseded by Washington State Department of Ecology. So, you know, in this instance it's saying, Hey, it's not our bailiwick. It's DOE's dealing with the water withdrawals here. And yet in this instance it seems to me that we're working counter to that if we approve it. So I agree. I think that this should be rejected. Any other discussion?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. All those in favor of the motion to recommend disapproval of C23-1, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: So that carries. Okay, so we'll turn to Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action, please.

Vice Chair Candler: I have two to get us started. First, I think Department of Ecology is clearly recognized as the authority for well permits.

Commissioner Mitchell: We still can't see on our screens.

Ms. Ruether: Oh, you can't see _____.

Vice Chair Candler: And then secondly I'd like something – I haven't quite figured out the language yet, but I think the petitioners' request for people seeking a well permit from the County to provide info about their neighboring wells is unduly burdensome – or at least burdensome.

Commissioner Mitchell: I like “unduly burdensome.”

Vice Chair Candler: Okay: “The petitioners request that those seeking a well permit from the County must provide information about their neighbors' wells is unduly....” And then after “County,” “provide information.” And we can specify that information but I think that might work. I don't know what you think.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Commissioner Mitchell: I've got a couple WACs.

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah, yeah, that's what I forgot. Thanks.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: I'm going to read just a portion of a couple of these things to add. “Under the Water Resources Act of 1971 in Washington state, RCW 90.54.005, the legislature” – I'm just going to read one sentence of it. The reference itself would be fine, unless you – should I read this or just –

Ms. Ruether: You want to read its entirety and then help me through it?

Commissioner Mitchell: Sure.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Commissioner Mitchell: And I'm just reading a portion of it because it's going to be referenced anyway.

Ms. Ruether: Oh, okay.

Commissioner Mitchell: First sentence: “...the legislature recognizes the critical importance of providing and securing sufficient water to meet the needs of people, farms, and fish.” So, again, I think we can just cite the WAC without all the verbiage.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Commissioner Mitchell: I'm just reading you why I think this is important. And number 1 says “Providing sufficient water for residential, commercial, and industrial needs.” That's one of the important things.

RCW 90.54.920, the main point there – if you –

Ms. Ruether: Okay, so should I do a different one for that?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yep. RCW 90.54.920: “Nothing in this act shall affect or operate to impair any existing water rights.” So again, just the reference – because there’s more to it. I’m just giving you the justification for it.

I’ve got two more. RCW 90.54.900. It’s certain rights authority not to be affected by the chapter. Again, that’s 90.54.900. And the last line of the first paragraph says “Nothing in this chapter shall enlarge or reduce Department of Ecology’s authority to regulate the surface use of waters of the state or structures in the underlying bed, tidelands, and shorelines.” In other words, they’re it for saying who’s got the wherewithal. The other – the fourth RCW to cite, please, is RCW 90.54. – did I already do .020?

(negative sounds from Commissioners)

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay. 90.54.020. And the main thing about this, it’s a general declaration of fundamentals for utilization and management of waters of the state, number 1. Under number 1, it says “The uses of water for domestic stock watering, industrial, commercial, agricultural irrigation, hydroelectric power production, mining, fish and wildlife maintenance and enhancement, recreational and thermal power production purposes, and preservation of environmental and ascetic values and all other uses compatible with the enjoyment of the public waters of the state are declared to be beneficial.” So people have a right to go for water and the DOE covers it. So I think those RCWs back __ Findings of Fact.

Ms. Ruether: Okay. Okay. Do you want me to – just the RCWs? Do you want me to add anything ___?

Commissioner Mitchell: No, just the RCWs themselves for reference.

Ms. Ruether: Okay, okay. All right, all right.

Commissioner Mitchell: We’ve done that before because it’s a lot of verbiage.

Ms. Ruether: Okay. Yeah, right, right. Okay.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Anybody else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: What was the first one?

Ms. Ruether: Oh, do you want to go back to that?

Commissioner Mitchell: Hang on. You put them in numerical order if you want to!

Ms. Ruether: Okay, yeah. I’m going to take this and put it back in the formal thing so I will edit all of this.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay. So the .920’s fine, the .900 is fine, .920 – excuse me. I’m sorry; it’s my fault. One of those 920s – there you go.

Ms. Ruether: This one?

Commissioner Mitchell: Nope, you got those three right. The fourth one is –

Ms. Ruether: Oh, okay.

Commissioner Mitchell: I know those numbers are so similar. I'm sorry. It's not my fault! The last one is RCW 90.54.005.

Vice Chair Candler: That was the first one. She's already got it.

Ms. Ruether: Oh. Oh, okay. Oh, just get rid of the top part. Okay, okay.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah. Thank you. The whole thing's good, if you want to have a little fun reading but....

Ms. Ruether: Okay. Got it.

Chair Raschko: Okay, is that sufficient for C23-1?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All right then. All those in favor of approving the Facts and Findings for C23-1, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: So it carries. Okay, we switch now to C23-2. The petition seeks to update the definition for "qualified professional" in SCC 14.04.

Commissioner Mitchell: I have a motion.

Chair Raschko: Please, Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: I move that the Planning Commission recommend that the Board of County Commissioners adopt the qualified professional amendment.

Vice Chair Candler: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to approve C23-2. Discussion, please?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have one question.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Woodmansee: This would probably be for maybe Jack. On this one, it's going direct to the County Stormwater Manual for that qualified, so are we basically – we already have that, this other language. The years and all that is already approved in our Stormwater Manual? So are we matching another code we have?

Jack Moore: Yes.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So we don't have two different qualifications listed?

Mr. Moore: Yes.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Essentially that's what we're doing. I just want to clarify that.

Mr. Moore: That's right.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Anything else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All those in favor of approving C23-2, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, that carries so we'll turn to Findings of Facts and Reasons for Action. We have two: An update definition of a "qualified professional" would save staff and the applicant time for review on projects by assuring quality work from any hired consultant. Secondly, an updated "qualified professional" definition would make Skagit County's definition like neighboring counties' definition and therefore consistent and equal to similar County code definitions.

So are there any comments on the proposed Findings of Fact?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a comment.

Chair Raschko: Please, Joe?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I'm not real impressed with this second bullet point because I wouldn't, as a policy maker or a recommender, I would never base my recommendations on what somebody else is doing. I wouldn't base my recommendations on what's right for *us*. And so I would strike that one and I would – my main bullet point would be that this – that the purpose of this is – that this allows the Skagit County Code to be consistent in different areas of the code as-is for the definition of this.

Chair Raschko: Would you like to substitute that for the second bullet?

Commissioner Woodmansee: That'd be great. Sure. And anybody that wants to help with the wording on that, I'd be totally fine with that!

Chair Raschko: You were doing pretty well!

Commissioner Mitchell: What you just said was good.

Chair Raschko: Why don't you go ahead and give it a try?

Vice Chair Candler: Are you indicating it allows internal consistency within the Skagit County Code?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah. “This would allow consistency within Skagit County Code – for the definition of ‘qualified professionals’” – “*regarding* (emphasis added) the definition of “qualified professionals.”

Ms. Ruether: Is that right? “...would allow consistency of the definition”? Maybe “consistency of”? Does that capture it?

Commissioner Rose: Should “code” be plural? Because you were referring to the stormwater code.

Ms. Ruether: Skagit County Code *with* the Stormwater Manual? Is that what you were getting at?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, that’s what it says.

Ms. Ruether: So with – “for consistency of the ‘qualified professional’ definition for Skagit County’s code and the Stormwater Manual”? Okay.

Commissioner Mitchell: Could you read that out loud for everybody one more time, please?

Ms. Ruether: Sure. “An updated ‘qualified professional’ definition would allow for consistency of the qualified professional definition for Skagit County’s code and the Stormwater Manual’s definition.” It’s a little chunky.

Commissioner Woodmansee: You could make the first word – or excuse me, in the middle line you could say “professional definitions” – plural – and then you could get rid of “definition” at the end.

Ms. Ruether: Oh, okay, so then I don’t have to repeat it. That might help. Okay, that’s better. That *is* better.

(short muffled exchange between Commissioners)

Commissioner Woodmansee: I’m fine with that.

Chair Raschko: Looks very good.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a comment on the first “qualified” actually, too.

Chair Raschko: On what?

Commissioner Woodmansee: On the first bullet point also.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Commissioner Woodmansee: My experience is that even if you have somebody with the four years versus the two, that it doesn’t assure quality work.

(chuckling from the Commissioners)

Vice Chair Candler: “Promoting.” Change it to “promoting.”

Ms. Ruether: We can’t guarantee anything!

Commissioner Woodmansee: ___ “promoting.” “More complete work,” maybe even?

Ms. Ruether: “...by promoting”? Is that the better word?

Commissioner Mitchell: Facilitating?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, that’s a fine word too. It’s not going to *assure* it, I can guarantee you that.

Commissioner Rose: “...by increasing the chances”?

(laughter)

Commissioner Woodmansee: Well, there’re some people that are not licensed that are smarter and better than most people. There’s no question about it. But anyways.

Commissioner Mitchell: So do you want “promoting”?

Commissioner Rose: “Promoting” would be good.

Ms. Ruether: You want “promoting” instead of “facilitating”? Okay.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I don’t even like the word “quality,” to be honest with you.

Commissioner Rose: You could say “higher quality” than it would have been. By promoting – I agree with you. I don’t like the word “quality” either.

Commissioner Woodmansee: “...by promoting” –

Ms. Ruether: Better?

Commissioner Woodmansee: No.

Ms. Ruether: Not better. Okay.

Commissioner Woodmansee: The words I’m thinking of are like “experience” and “more detailed” and stuff like that – “more thorough,” “promoting more thorough”? I don’t know. I don’t like the word “quality,” though.

Commissioner Rose: Is “relevant” appropriate for that?

Chair Raschko: Is this whole purpose, though, to save time? Or is it to promote the better work?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I would think it’s to promote better work.

Commissioner Rose: It's probably both.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, but it says right in the beginning is that promoting better work is the means to get to the goal of saving time. That's the way I read it.

Vice Chair Candler: It does say that, it does say that!

Commissioner Woodmansee: So if you have four years, they're not going to read your review as much because you've got four years and so it'll save them, you know, review time?

Commissioner Rose: I think the implication is different than that. I think it's if you have more experience you're going to know what's needed, you're going to submit a more complete application, and you'll address the issues that need to be addressed without being asked multiple times to resubmit because you didn't address a, b, and c. So it would be a time saver – a big one.

Chair Raschko: But that's not the real goal of this, is it? I thought the goal would be to assure that the work is of professional quality. And in doing so you might even save some time.

Commissioner Mitchell: Then maybe put it – what you're suggesting is putting that piece in first.

Vice Chair Candler: "An updated definition of a 'qualified professional'..."

Commissioner Mitchell: – and then save you time at the end.

Vice Chair Candler: "An updated definition of 'qualified professional' would promote experienced work from a hired consultant and save staff time." Is that the idea?

Chair Raschko: That sounded very good.

Vice Chair Candler: Experience – did we land on experienced work or did we – and _____. Oh, we left – somehow we lost "hired consultant," but I don't know if we care.

Commissioner Rose: Inserting that stuff in the beginning allows you to get rid of some of that stuff at the end.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay, after "work" put "from a hired consultant" just in front of "and" where you're at.

Ms. Ruether: Okay, okay.

Vice Chair Candler: "...from a hired consultant" and then delete everything after "projects."

Ms. Ruether: Okay. Okay, just delete all that.

Chair Raschko: Excellent.

Commissioner Mitchell: Please read again out loud for everybody.

Ms. Ruether: "An updated definition of a 'qualified professional' would promote experienced work from a hired consultant and save staff and the applicant time for review on projects."

Commissioner Mitchell: That's nice.

Chair Raschko: Okay, are we satisfied? Anything else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, all those in favor of the Findings of Facts and Reasons for Actions for C23-2, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: So that carries. Okay. We'll move on to C23-3, ORSRI Allowed Use Amendment. This petition would amend SCC 14.16.500 (3) to allow for trails in the public Open Space of Regional Statewide Importance to be an outright permitted use. Is there a motion?

Commissioner Hughes: I have a motion but I would like clarification on a statement that's made under the proposed Findings of Fact. Do you want the motion first or would you like me to ask for my clarification?

Chair Raschko: I think we should deal with the motion and then alter the Findings of Fact as necessary to support the motion.

Commissioner Hughes: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Does anybody else agree with that?

(sounds of agreement from Commissioners)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Commissioner Hughes: I move the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners to deny OSRSI Allowed Use(s) Amendment.

Vice Chair Candler: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded to recommend denial of C23-3. The floor's open for discussion.

Commissioner Hughes: May I ask for a point of clarification? This allowed use amendment has baffled me during several conversations we've had on this. And I was set on the direction I was going but when I saw some Findings of Facts to allow it there was new information from what I hadn't had before. And so I just want to find out if that is new information that would change my mind. So under – if we were to approve this, it says "Removing trails as an administrative use would not eliminate requirements for review and permitting in OSRSI zone. It would allow for more efficient permitting with less time and costs for smaller projects. Larger projects or trailhead would continue to require an administrative special use permit." We never had conversation on that so I just would like to know: Is that a statement of fact? Could staff help in any way?

Ms. Ruether: I think the idea with that was that SEPA would be triggered if it was a larger project, and there were other grading permits that would be triggered if it's larger. So I have to look – I guess it depends on, you know – I'll look up the SEPA trigger for a grading permit. What is that?

Mr. Eckroth: It's 500 cubic yards.

Ms. Ruether: Five hundred cubic yards.

Commissioner Hughes: So it's a grading permit.

Ms. Ruether: Right.

Commissioner Hughes: Okay. And I did read that and that didn't change my mind so I will stick to my motion and I'll go on with my reasons why. I went back and read our Planning Commission February 11th, 2020, conversation on this, and at that point it was to say trails is a permitted use. We moved to make trails and primary and secondary trailheads a hearing examiner special use and we spent a lot of time on this. We – I was impressed with our deliberations at that point. We were very thorough. We listened to public comment. There was public comment from the Forestry Advisory Board that identified the desire to have property owners adjacent to the trails be provided notice and not to classify trails in the OSRSI as outright permitted. And then there was another comment made by a person that said "Trails should be part of a methodical, well-analyzed plan that satisfies and balances public goals that include the preservation of open space through creation of wildlife corridors based on movement patterns and sensitivities of local fauna, and the development of the OSRSI for human active recreation such as bicycling. Furthermore, the public has a right to expect demonstrated balance of priorities, transparency, and the right to comment as a special use process currently offers."

I don't see with the conversations we've had this time around that anything has changed, and that is why I made the motion.

Commissioner Mitchell: I've got a comment.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead, Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: I concur with what Commissioner Hughes had said and done. I had also investigated best information, input, and things like that. And I think what startles me – maybe it's because we're post-Covid time – is that a lot of people didn't know about this round and I'm kind of surprised at that. It was very one-sided. And so doing the research and finding out the reasons why, I thought the same thing. I thought we had done a *really* thorough job with lots of good reasons. Our Findings of Facts of Reasons are supporting policy and goals, Countywide Policies, and the information from the Forest Advisory Board was key. And I think the arguments and discussions that the Forest Advisory Board (provided) were spot on. It's not just about public lands; therefore, we should just put, you know, a trail or whatever without people knowing. We're supposed to be about transparency and that was part of it, was people knowing what's going on and the whys, not just the trail builders. I don't have anything against trails. I love them. But it's the adjacent property owners that get abused when the general public – and there are those; I mean, we have them in our neighborhood all the time where they pop out going between Larrabee and Blanchard. And once a side trail gets started they repeat again and again and people have troubles. And the Forest Advisory Board folks were very thorough in their recommendation, saying, Look, this is an ongoing problem. And forest industry lives with this. And we're talking about trails in such kind – you know, in such areas, in similar areas. And I think it's part of the due

process for the public to ensure that there's transparency, and that's for notification before these things go down.

And so in a circular way I'm going right back to ___. Our Findings of Facts and Reasons and everything that we discussed back in 2020 was sound. It was February 2020. And so I concur nothing's changed. One last piece, if you'll bear with: When this was proposed to us by staff – oh, heck – it was last early spring, late winter, and two of us asked, Well, what's changed about it? The general gist is nothing, absolutely nothing. And so here we're going through the same machinations for the same thing. And look: The people have the right for transparency.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Candler: I too remember putting time in on this but I was a little bit more fuzzy on the details, and I just want to express I *really* appreciate the work you did, Commissioner Hughes, on bringing that up and remembering that in more detail, and Commissioner Mitchell also. I agree with what has been said, and that's all I have.

Chair Raschko: Others? I agree as well. If there's no further comment or additions, we'll go to a vote. So all those in favor or recommending non-adoption – where are we? – of C23-3, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

Commissioner Rose: Nay.

Chair Raschko: Okay. And any abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, so it is approved.

Mr. Eckroth: If I may, Commissioner Hutchison was muted. So –

Chair Raschko: She was what?

Mr. Eckroth: She was muted so we weren't able to get a vote from her.

Chair Raschko: Well, she can vote right now if she wishes.

Mr. Eckroth: Yes. Commissioner Hutchison?

Commissioner Jen Hutchison: I'll abstain.

Chair Raschko: She what?

Commissioner Mitchell: Abstain.

Chair Raschko: Abstained. So we have one abstention. Okay, so we'll turn to Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action, and I'll start by asking, Did you bring the Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action from the last time?

Commissioner Mitchell: I did.

Chair Raschko: Would it be appropriate to use those again?

Commissioner Mitchell: For the most part, I think they were really sound. I might even add what we didn't do back then was what the Forest Advisory Board had said. And also a point that Commissioner Woodmansee had hit pretty hard the last time and that was one of the things is that – and we're experiencing that right now. What Commissioner Woodmansee had said back then ____ Findings and Facts and Reason that there's a lot of turnover with staff in time. We've seen that now and things move, things change. We've also had times when staff was championing something in a very biased way, versus non-biased, in the past and working scenes behind the thing instead of staying neutral, presenting from – it gets real important – and you guys have been good about this so thank you, Jack. It's so important for staff to present the facts as they are and remain neutral and allow the public to have their input, the Planning Commission to have their input, and we all do our thing. The two legs go to the third leg, which is the big Board of County Commissioners. It's very important so thank you for doing that. And that was one of the main points that Commissioner Woodmansee had said so I want to add this into Findings of Fact if you help us, if you still feel the same way. Because of turnover and those kinds of things, it's very important to have people know what's being done, to be unbiased and present things factually. And so that's important. So there were – one, two, three, four, five, six, seven. The Findings of Facts, February 20th, February 2020, and the big docket was signed in June. So A, the amendment is consistent with Goal 2B and Policy 2B1.2.

Ms. Ruether: Amendment is consistent with Policy 2B?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, I'll go slower. I'm sorry. I wonder – do you want to just cut and paste?

Ms. Ruether: Yeah, or maybe you can just give it to me and I can type it in while you guys are doing the rest of your ___ or something like that. If you can just hand it to me then I can –

Chair Raschko: You're going type it in while –

Commissioner Mitchell: I've got another one, hang on.

(several people speaking at the same time)

Commissioner Mitchell: Here's the – the actual copy of the transmittal. The two pages.

Ms. Ruether: Okay. I can type it up and put it on the screen.

Commissioner Mitchell: (inaudible)

Ms. Ruether: Okay. Okay, I can type those up. Thank you.

Commissioner Mitchell: And what I would like to add to that is the policy recommendations that the Forest Advisory had done, because it still applies. It's not changed, and I'm kind of surprised that we missed those the last time. If you can – do you want to add this, Sarah, and we can –

Chair Raschko: ____, please. Go ahead.

Vice Chair Candler: I'm really torn between reiterating what we did, which I think is good in a way, or just saying what Commissioner Hughes said, which is that we have dealt with this in 2020. We thoroughly looked at this, and nothing has changed. And reference this or reference back to it. There are two ways to do it and I don't have a huge preference. I just wanted to throw that out.

Commissioner Mitchell: That would be fine. It might be helpful if people saw what was there.

Chair Raschko: Well, it doesn't matter, from what she's saying. She's saying we've done this.

Vice Chair Candler: I think at a minimum I think what we should do, even if we put all of what is in that motion that – the former recorded motion – even if we put all that, I think at a minimum we need to put what Commissioner Hughes said, which is that we, you know, we have looked at this pretty thoroughly recently – somewhat recently.

Chair Raschko: Okay, so you're proposing that we do not go through this list –

Ms. Ruether: Or we can do both, too. I mean –

Chair Raschko: Frankly –

Vice Chair Candler: Probably these guys haven't even seen it yet so we really can't discuss it without them seeing it.

Ms. Ruether: Okay, should I type it up?

Vice Chair Candler: Sorry – yes. I just wanted to throw it out there for discussion that it's – there's more than one way to do it.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah. I would like to enforce that regardless of that, if we just refer to the other one, if that's what the group decides, is to add in what these other policies and goals that were also supportive of it, because they're key for lots of the areas where these trails would be adjacent to those places.

Chair Raschko: Does anybody need a short break while she types?

Vice Chair Candler: I'm taking one.

Chair Raschko: All right.

(break)

Chair Raschko: Okay, we are back in session and we have before us the recommended Findings of Facts and Reasons for Action. The first one, the amendment is consistent with Goal 2B and Policy 2B-1.2 and Goal 2E and Policy 2E-1.1 of the Comprehensive Plan. Is everybody fine with that?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: The amendment is consistent with the Skagit County Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan.

The amendment has been found to be consistent with Goal 9 and Policies 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.

The Planning Commission finds that as staff turn over there can be different policies regarding how the code is interpreted.

The Planning Commission finds that requiring a Hearing Examiner Special Use review put(s) the proponent and public on a more even playing field.

The Planning Commission finds that the cost difference is negligible between an Administrative Special Use and a Hearing Examiner Special Use.

Vice Chair Candler: I have a comment.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner?

Vice Chair Candler: It strikes me for the first – one, two, three – the first three, the language – we just have to change the verbiage of the amendment – is consistent – because we’re doing something different now. It doesn’t change the content, but we need to change the syntax there.

Commissioner Mitchell: What do you suggest?

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah, current code, instead of the amendment. So everywhere it says “the amendment,” put “current code.”

Ms. Ruether: Oh, okay.

Vice Chair Candler: In those first three.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Because when we did this, we were recommending something different.

Vice Chair Candler: Right.

Commissioner Mitchell: Right.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Commissioner Mitchell: If anybody’s interested, I do have the policies that were referenced here written out, if anybody needs to read them for any reason whatsoever.

Vice Chair Candler: You mean, like, Goal 2B and 2B-1.2 ____?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, and Countywide Policies and that kind of thing.

Vice Chair Candler: I'd like to take a look. Thank you.

Commissioner Mitchell: Is it okay with everybody if I put forth what the FAB had suggested for the goal policies that were referenced? Is anybody interested in hearing those? Because we didn't do that before but I think they still apply.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay. So, Sarah –

Chair Raschko: Isn't she going to need to type this?

Commissioner Mitchell: I don't know.

Chair Raschko: Can you read it?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah. I'll read this first for everybody. If you think it's appropriate, then we can ask Sarah to help us with it. If not, then, you know, we'll just pass it on. So the Forest Advisory Board, they had said "Comprehensive Plan policy supporting our request include Goal 4B-5.4 that says 'Recreational and park issues: Recreational opportunities on forest resource land shall be permitted uses'" – this is emphasized by the letter writer, or the FAB – "where they will not conflict with forest practice activities on these lands or when such impacts can be fully mitigated" – emphasis added.

The next one was 4B-6, which says "Minimize land use conflicts and promote mitigation of conflicts on the lands adjacent to forestlands."

And the third and final is 4B-7: "Establish in all aspects of forest management regulations support for the forest product industry and its ability to keep economically managed forests."

Vice Chair Candler: I have a question. Kathy, did we not *have* that when we did this? Is that why we didn't reference these four?

Commissioner Mitchell: I think we just missed it. We had this but we just didn't – or I don't remember – I didn't remember seeing this discussed – shall we put this in the Findings of Fact? – either. But this is there.

Vice Chair Candler: I couldn't remember,

Commissioner Mitchell: And I do think that their input was essential on why because it does –

Vice Chair Candler: Can we just add to that first paragraph those other goal numbers maybe? I don't know. I don't know. It was just an idea.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, we could – if people like the idea we can just list very simply saying the Forest Advisory Board in 2020 had recommended – or had referenced Goal 4B-5.4.

Ms. Ruether: So should I add this as a Finding of Fact or –

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, ____.

Ms. Ruether: Okay. All right, all right. Just to be clear.

Commissioner Mitchell: And this is still – when we write this out it's fully up for people striking it. That's not my call; it's your call.

Commissioner Hughes: I think we need the date.

Commissioner Mitchell: That sentence needs to start – yeah, with when – the date is January 22nd, 2020. So “The Forest Advisory Board recommended referencing Goal 4B-5.4, 4B-6, and 4B-7.” And just for – I know things change with accessibility. When I went to the Big Magilla of all the public comments – you know how you can go back and read that stuff? Their email, when they sent this stuff in, was just referenced with email from the Forest Advisory, Dave Chamberlain. It was not included in that stuff. I had to find a copy of this elsewhere. And so it's one of those little ____ things we have with links not working and things not doing – so I don't know what we're going to do about that kind of thing.

Vice Chair Candler: I think we just need a *little* bit more verbiage in this sentence because it just doesn't – it's not a full sentence. Something like “In their comments on the 2019 docket of Comprehensive Plan policy and map and code amendments...”

Commissioner Mitchell: “...referenced these goals” or “referenced” and then those three goals.

Vice Chair Candler: No, “recommended in their comments” doesn't – I don't like that language. We need to say that they “referenced” in their comments these goals.

Chair Raschko: But that'd be saying it twice now so we need to –

Vice Chair Candler: But, I mean, the point is that they were trying to get us to do something. We just need a little bit of background about what *they* were trying to do, which was, at *that* time, would not be consistent with *this*.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Just take the word “recommended” out.

Ms. Ruether: Take “recommended” out?

Vice Chair Candler: Yes.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So they commented and they referenced this.

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah, yeah. “Referenced these goals, which would not be consistent with the current petition,” or something like that – or “which would be consistent with denial of the petition.”

Commissioner Mitchell: And this is still consistent and true for today.

Vice Chair Candler: I think it's getting there.

Commissioner Hughes: Okay, to back up, I think the January 22nd might need to be taken out and just start with the Forest Advisory Board and their comments on the 2019 docket. I don't think we need both.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Sure.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yep, that's fine.

Vice Chair Candler: And I think we need to take out the word "these" at the end of the next sentence – toward the end.

Chair Raschko: Excellent.

Ms. Hughes: Okay. And I'm still going to start __. "The Forest Advisory Board in their comments on the 2019 docket, Comprehensive Plan policies" – so take "plan" out, I believe.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay, don't – just it says it twice.

(brief, inaudible wordsmithing comments from Commissioners)

Chair Raschko: Okay, how's that look?

Commissioner Mitchell: Better.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Anything else? I was wondering – I'm not necessarily promoting, but should we mention here that we went through this in 2020?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes.

Chair Raschko: I would recommend putting that first.

Commissioner Woodmansee: That was basically Commissioner Hughes' opening statement.

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah, Commissioner Hughes had something in her notes that was verbiage for that, I think, that she read when she was introducing this motion.

Commissioner Hughes: Okay, let me –

Commissioner Mitchell: She's looking.

Commissioner Hughes: I think I just said it. Now, what did I say? "On February 11th, 2020, the Planning Commission had thorough conversation" – "had thorough deliberation..."

(mostly inaudible comments regarding a spelling error)

Commissioner Mitchell: On the same topic?

Commissioner Hughes: Well, here's what we discussed: C4, modify Skagit County Code 14.06.50(3) and (4), trails in the OSRSI, trails is a permitted use. That's how it started.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay. Can you say that slow so she can type it in?

Commissioner Hughes: Do we want the whole thing written out? “C4, modify Skagit County Code 14.06.500.

Ms. Ruether: 14.06.500?

Commissioner Hughes: 14.16.500 – I think I misspoke on that. “...16.500, parentheses 3 and parentheses 4, trails in OSRSI.”

Ms. Ruether: Okay, is that it?

Vice Chair Candler: Is it CF or C4?

Commissioner Woodmansee: C4. Yep.

Vice Chair Candler: And then do you want to – okay, so “our recommendation today –

Chair Raschko: Well, do you not want to say what the result was then?

Vice Chair Candler: I was thinking to say “Our recommendation today is consistent with that” or something like that?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes.

Commissioner Hughes: “This recommendation is consistent.”

Commissioner Mitchell: With those findings?

Vice Chair Candler: Something like that. It doesn’t have to be exactly that, but...

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: If it was me, I would say “which are listed below” and I would make it a different bullet point. We don’t have to do that but that is what I would do. And then we need to take the last one, though, and make it separate because that’s not part of it. You could even single-space that because that would be almost like a quote.

Chair Raschko: Wait a minute. You want a separate bullet for that last sentence?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes.

Vice Chair Candler: No. We don’t need a separate bullet for it. That’s part of the same paragraph.

(several Commissioners speaking at the same time)

Vice Chair Candler: And then I would make a colon there and I would indent the findings that are from *that* time and single-space them.

(several Commissioners speaking at the same time)

Ms. Ruether: Do you want, like, a title at the top?

Vice Chair Candler: I just want them indented.

Ms. Ruether: Oh, okay, okay. I see.

Chair Raschko: You want a subset of the first bullet.

Vice Chair Candler: Yep, exactly. That's what I want.

(several Commissioners speaking at the same time)

Vice Chair Candler: Everything up until the new stuff we just put about the Goal 4B. And then I would put something like – yeah, I would do that. Do you guys like that?

Commissioner Hughes: I'd like to modify a little bit.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay.

Commissioner Hughes: Where we say "Our recommendation today is consistent with those findings," I'd like to say "Today's recommendation is consistent with those findings," to be respectful that a majority is working here.

Chair Raschko: "Recommendation" should be singular, I believe.

Ms. Ruether: Oh, okay.

(sounds of assent from other Commissioners)

Vice Chair Candler: And then I don't know if we want to put – there's two ways we could do it. You could put "additionally" and then whatever else we're going to add tonight, or you could take the bottom one and put it up above that so it's not part of the subset.

(mostly inaudible comments)

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah, I think it works.

Chair Raschko: I think it looks really good.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, I do too.

Chair Raschko: Anything else?

Commissioner Mitchell: Just fixing the line spaces _____.

Ms. Ruether: Yeah, I will take it back. I'm going to go and proof it in my office before I have Tim sign it! Yes, oh yes!

Chair Raschko: All right, if we could bring Jen in for a vote. Can you hear us, Jen?

Commissioner Hutchison: I sure can.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Where are we? Okay, all those in favor of approving the Findings of Facts for C23-3, please say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: How did you vote, Jen?

Commissioner Hutchison: I am agreement with your Findings of Facts.

Chair Raschko: Okay, great. Thank you. And all those opposed?

Commissioner Rose: I’m abstaining.

Chair Raschko: We have one abstention. Okay. Well, thank you. All right, we’re moving to 23-4, Master Planned Resort Designation. Was there a motion for discussion?

Vice Chair Candler: I’ll move that the Planning Commission recommend the Board of County Commissioners adopt the Master Planned Resort Designation Amendment.

Commissioner Mitchell: Second.

Chair Raschko: It’s been moved and seconded to recommend adoption of C23-4. Discussion, please?

Vice Chair Candler: My reasoning is that the Department is indicating the current language is incorrect and should be removed.

Chair Raschko: Okay, anybody else?

Unidentified Commissioner: No.

Chair Raschko: All right, all those in favor of recommending adoption of C23-4, please say – excuse me. Can we bring Jen in, please? All those in favor, say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those that are against?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Any abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: So that passes unanimously. Thank you. So Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action. We have some proposed verbiage. It says “The proposal would correct an error in the language of SCC 14.16.900(1)(b), which is incorrectly written, to refer to MPRs as a use which would require a special use permit and thus would be subject to the regulations in SCC 14.16.900(1)(d) because the language is incorrect it should be removed.”

Second, Master Planner Resorts are a Comprehensive Plan map designation and not a use, so it should not be included as a use which requires a special use permit.

Comments on the proposed Findings, please.

Commissioner Mitchell: Looks good.

Chair Raschko: Nobody? Okay. All those in favor of approving the Findings of Facts and Reasons for Action for C23-4 – can we bring Jen in, please? Okay, say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Any abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. It passes unanimously. Okay, C23-5, Fire Marshal Code Amendment.

Vice Chair Candler: I move that the Planning Commission recommend that the County Board of Commissioners adopt the fire marshal code amendment.

Commissioner Henley: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded to recommend adoption of C23-5. Discussion, please?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, can we please bring Commissioner Hutchison in? Okay, why don't we leave her here until we need to flash something on the screen again? Okay? So all those in favor, say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: So it passes unanimously. Okay, we have Findings of Fact, Reasons for Action.

First, firefighting foam has been known to have carcinogenic elements and many sources have been recalled due to the hazardous impact on users and the surrounding environment. Water is now the accepted standard for fire suppression in wildland environments.

Secondly, residents required to use firefighting foam under the current regulations are not trained on how to handle firefighting materials and the foam types are often recalled and will expire. Therefore, it is prudent to ban hazardous foam and have water as the standard for Skagit County residents in these areas and use only water for firefighting rather than subjecting residents without training to dangerous materials.

Are there comments on the proposed findings?

Commissioner Rose: The only comment I have is that it seems like the – was it the Fire Marshal? Somebody who spoke said if somebody wants to use foam they can. So this is – it's still an option, but it's not a requirement. And I think maybe that that should be written down as a Finding of Fact, that if somebody's really set on using foam this does not disallow them from using it.

Commissioner Mitchell: *Approved* foams.

Commissioner Rose: Approved foams, thank you.

Chair Raschko: Well, what this basically does, I believe, is just deny the fire departments from having it. Am I accurate in that?

Commissioner Mitchell: No. It would – just the nozzle, right? It's removing the requirement for the nozzle, correct?

Mr. Moore: It's removing the requirement for that foam and the nozzle to be out there on those properties that are not within the fire district, and allowing you more – the more modern and common way of fighting the fire, because the foams, in some cases, take special training and in some cases they're recalled, so they're not the preferred method anymore.

Chair Raschko: I guess my point was that what this has to do with is what's allowed in the fire departments and not what people are doing on their own.

Commissioner Rose: I see, so it's irrelevant.

Chair Raschko: Right.

Commissioner Rose: Okay, accepted. Yep.

Chair Raschko: Anything else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. And Jen is here? All those in favor of approving the Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action for C23-5, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And are there abstentions? No? Okay. C23-6, Temporary Manufactured Homes Title Notice Requirement. Does anybody care to make a motion?

Commissioner Mitchell: Chair, I'll make a motion. The Planning Commission – I move the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners to approve the amendment to require a title notice for temporary manufactured homes.

Chair Raschko: A second, please?

Commissioner Hughes: I'll second.

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's moved and seconded to approve C23-6. Discussion, please?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: No discussion? Okay. All those in favor of approving the motion to recommend adoption of C23-6, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Any people abstaining?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. We'll turn to Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action.

The code provisions for these mobile homes are temporary, and therefore the title process should reflect that.

And secondly, Skagit County Code 14.04 states temporary manufactured homes must be removed from the property when the family member or farm worker is no longer using the manufactured homes. This item clarifies the process to ensure that the temporary homes are removed when they are no longer needed.

So any changes to that?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a question.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Woodmansee: And I probably should have asked it already but my question's for Jack. Let's say the situation changes, because in the past – our ADU limits are much higher now, size-wise. And so could we implement a process that doesn't require removal but there could be a mid-step that is if something like this could be converted to an ADU _____ of codes? I'm trying to get away from absolutely you're going to tear it all out and now you can put it back because you went through the ADU permit. Do you see where I'm going with that?

Mr. Moore: Yes, I do, Commissioner, and that is allowable. If they come to the conclusion of the use that was allowed under their special use permit, they can then look at other potential approvable uses at that point. So if it can be converted to an accessory dwelling unit, we can process that as an administrative building permit. Other folks might have a new dynamic in their family where someone else may need some care and so they can revise their special use permit to allow for that. So there are options.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah. Thank you.

Mr. Moore: Mm-hmm. You're welcome.

Chair Raschko: All right, anything else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, all those in favor of approving the Findings of Fact and Reasons for Action for C23-6, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And anybody abstaining?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, it's unanimous. Okay, C23-9, Primitive Campground Definition Amendment.

Vice Chair Candler: I have a motion.

Chair Raschko: Please.

Vice Chair Candler: I move that the Planning Commission recommend that the Board of County Commissioners adopt the Primitive Campground Definition Amendment.

Commissioner Mitchell: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded to recommend adoption of C23-9. The floor's open for discussion.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion, C23-9, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Abstaining?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. It passes. Findings of Fact, Reasons for Action. The definition of a “primitive campground” needs updating because the current definition is unclear if recreational vehicles can or should be allowed on a primitive campground, and the Department would like to ensure amenities are kept minimal for these sites.

Secondly, requiring residents with a primitive campground to abide by Skagit County Code 14.16.945 will ensure campgrounds, which are intended to be low impact, do not include more than two recreational vehicles.

Are there any additions or changes to be made?

Commissioner Henley: Sounds good.

Commissioner Mitchell: Nope.

Chair Raschko: All right. All those in favor of approving the Findings of Fact and Reasons for Actions for C23-9, please say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Abstaining?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, that passes. C23-10, Countywide Planning Policies Update.

Commissioner Mitchell: I have a motion, Chair.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: I move the Planning Commission recommends to the Board of County Commissioners to approve the amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies.

Commissioner Henley: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to recommend adoption of C23-10. Is there any discussion?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All right. All those in favor of approving the motion to recommend adoption of C23-10, please say “aye.”

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Anybody abstaining?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Findings of Fact or Reasons for Action. Goal 12.17 of the Skagit CPPs currently includes language for when the Skagit BRB could be disbanded per RCW 36.93.230 that have been met by all cities in Skagit County. Does everybody understand that one?

Vice Chair Candler: No. Maybe we should spell out “BRB.”

Chair Raschko: It is the –

Ms. Ruether: Boundary Review Board.

Vice Chair Candler: Do you think we should?

Chair Raschko: Boundary Review Board.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yep.

Chair Raschko: Yeah.

Vice Chair Candler: But do you think we should?

Chair Raschko: I think we should say Boundary Review Board since it’s not mentioned anywhere else.

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Chair Raschko: The Growth Management Act Steering Committee has determined Skagit County has met these requirements and voted in December 2021 to direct the County Commissioners to disband the Skagit BRB and to provide new language for CPP 12.17.

Thirdly, on or before June 20th, (sic) 2025, the Board of Commissioners shall, as authorized by RCW 36.93.230, take action to disband the Boundary Review Board for Skagit County, having met the requirements per RCW 36.93.230.

Vice Chair Candler: And just for clarification, I don’t care if it’s BRB at the second two. I just think it should be spelled out the one time.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Chair Raschko: That's fine. Okay, anything else? Changes? Additions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, all those in favor of approving the Findings of Facts and Reason for Actions for C23-10, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: All those opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And any abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: No? Okay, finally we have C23-11, General Code Language Clean Up.

Commissioner Mitchell: I have a motion, Chair.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: I move the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners to adopt the amendments to stormwater and wireless facilities code.

Chair Raschko: Is there a second?

Commissioner Henley: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded to recommend adoption of C23-11. All those in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And abstaining?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: So that is passed. Finding of Fact is: These changes are necessary to correct several mistakes and inconsistencies found in Skagit County Code for stormwater, land disturbance, and wireless facilities code in 2022.

Does anybody wish to make additions or changes?

Vice Chair Candler: I like it.

Commissioner Henley: Yeah, it's all boiler plate.

Commissioner Mitchell: Go for it.

Chair Raschko: Okay, all those in favor of approving the Findings of Facts and Reasons for Actions for C23-11, please say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And anybody abstaining?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: Chair?

Chair Raschko: Yes?

Vice Chair Candler: I think – sorry. I apologize for having to do this, but if we could go back to the recorded motion on C23-3 just very briefly, I think we need to change the language when we changed when it said "the amendment." We changed it to "current plan." Now that we've reformatted, I think we just have to in those three sentences change "current plan" back to "the amendment" because we're referencing language that we know and want to try to quote. Does that make sense?

Chair Raschko: Can you bring that up?

Ms. Ruether: Yeah, it's up now. Which portion was that?

Vice Chair Candler: So we changed the first three of the now circled points from "the amendment" to the "current plan" and we just want to go back to "the Amendment" because we're now kind of like ___.

Ms. Ruether: Instead of "current code," "the amendment"?

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: Right? Is that right, Kathy?

Commissioner Mitchell: Mm-hmm.

Vice Chair Candler: From what you had on the –

Commissioner Mitchell: Mm-hmm. Because language matters.

Vice Chair Candler: Well, yeah, and then we can't – it wouldn't make sense because we changed the format.

Ms. Ruether: Did I catch them all? I think it was one, two, three – the first three. Any other ones?

Vice Chair Candler: Yes. Thank you.

Ms. Ruether: Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: Can I just say something? I want to thank whoever – did you draw up this?

Ms. Ruether: Mm-hmm.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you for the hard work. It's made it very helpful to us to move things along tonight, I think. So I appreciate it.

Chair Raschko: Okay, well, that concludes the deliberations on the 2023 docket. I want to thank everybody involved in this for all the hard work they did. Okay. With that, we will move to the Director's Update. Mr. Moore?

Mr. Moore: Thank you, Chair. I just want to share a couple of notable projects that the Planning Department – Planning and Development Services – has been involved with recently. One in our building department, the final approval for some Camp Korey modifications down in Lake McMurray. They've been doing a number of upgrades over the last few years and this is – they just completed one for their main building that we were able to grant final approval for.

In the fire marshal end of things, our deputy fire marshals have been in close contact with the local fire departments in sharing all the updates that we've been receiving on the battery energy storage systems – technical aspects, safety requirements, et cetera. We are constantly learning more on these as we do have at least one application in right now on that. So we're just continuing to coordinate with the districts to make sure that safety protocols are addressed during our approval process and that the districts are well aware of what's happening out there.

We also helped get to the finish line a project that PACCAR was working on – some expansion on their parking, along with some electric vehicle charging area and associated infrastructure for that. So that went fairly smoothly and they've reached the end of that phase of their improvements.

In a notable case in code compliance that we've been working on for quite a while on Grip Road north of Sedro-Woolley went to court. During the hearing, another family member showed up – of the property owner – pleased with the judge to allow them to take lead and try to make some improvements there. The judge did grant that so our code compliance staff are working closely with that new family member now at the judge's directive to ensure that progress is made, and the Department will report back to the court at the next hearing date.

Another thing, in our natural resources we've been working with our consultant on our Shorelines Master Program. Earlier this year the Department of Ecology held a public hearing here at Skagit County and collected public comment and then has provided feedback to Skagit County on our draft plan. So right now staff is working with our consultant on that to draft our responses to the

Department of Ecology comments. So that's a great undertaking but (we're) looking forward to helping that get to the finish line.

So that is all I have for this evening unless the Commission has questions?

Chair Raschko: Anything for –

Commissioner Henley: I've got a question. Is there any likelihood that elements of some aspect of large energy storage systems would come before the Planning Commission sometime in the near future?

Mr. Moore: I don't anticipate that happening at this point. These are specific development permits under code at the moment, so unless, you know, there's some directive from the County Commissioners that, you know, code would need to be changed then – if a development code was proposed – of modification – then we would – *that* may come before the Planning Commission, but at this point I don't know that that is happening.

Commissioner Henley: Okay, thank you.

Vice Chair Candler: Can I ask a follow-up? Is that to say that there is a place in Skagit County where either there's a permitted use for this battery storage facility thing that's being discussed?

Mr. Moore: Yes. Under – a number of our zones will allow it as a special use. As long as a special use permit can be approved, then they would be able to be installed.

Vice Chair Candler: So that doesn't come in front of us.

Mr. Moore: No. No, it would not. That's not a legislative action. So I will say just as a follow-up to that, we did meet with Puget Sound Energy to try to get a better handle on at least their viewpoint on the demand for these installations. And we found it rather informative. They thought that in their entire Pacific Northwest region – Puget Sound region – that they would only need 10 installations of any size. And those are, they thought, were pretty much the ones that have been applied for in various locations already. So they didn't see a huge rush coming to Skagit County. They were open to some suggestions we had on if they could steer their partners to particular substations, but they described where those larger installations would be, and within one mile of a major substation is where those would be. I found it a bit interesting that they are concurrently working on or exploring the idea of smaller units that would be neighborhood-based or even individual building-based battery energy storage systems. That's a technology that they're looking at right now and studying.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Are those locations – is that already – you said they applied for, but are those locations publicly known now?

Mr. Moore: Yes, yes.

Commissioner Mitchell: Do you have any idea where the closest ones are to us?

Mr. Moore: Yes. So just on the east side of Sedro-Woolley there's a substation that we've had – we've talked to two different companies that have had potential proposals there. There's also one up somewhat near the Port, near the – I'd say closer to the transfer station, I guess.

Mr. Eckroth: Off of Ovenell.

Mr. Moore: Ovenell Road. Thank you, Robby. So we have one there. We – because of the description of the size of the substation that's needed, we'd also asked if they had considered the one out near March's Point, just south of the freeway. There's a large substation up there. So apparently we don't have any – we haven't had an applicant come in and speak to us about that location, but we thought that might even be a better location than Sedro-Woolley substation, at least community-wise.

Commissioner Mitchell: Right. I would imagine the Sedro-Woolley people think so too.

Mr. Moore: Possibly so.

Chair Raschko: Anything else for staff?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you very much.

Mr. Moore: You're welcome.

Chair Raschko: Okay, we'll turn to Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements. And I'm going to go first. First, I wanted to thank everybody for the work they did on the docket and congratulations on getting it done. Second, I'd like to wish Sarah well. And I'm going to miss you. And quite frankly, speaking for myself, I found you very, very good to work with and I think you made our jobs easier.

Ms. Ruether: You made my job easier too, so I would like to return the compliment.

Chair Raschko: Well, to all of us. Thank you. Yeah, I just hope the best for you.

Ms. Ruether: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Martha, have you anything?

Commissioner Rose: I don't have anything. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Joe?

Commissioner Woodmansee: No.

Commissioner Henley: No, I've said everything I want to say.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Vice Chair Candler: I'm sad to see you go. Other than that, I don't have anything.

Commissioner Mitchell: This is just as much for Jack and Robby as it is for Sarah: Sarah has been the consummate professional planner. She has been a delight to work with. We really are sorry to see you go but really am happy for you for those kinds of things. You always were thorough, responsive, factual-based, unbiased. If you didn't know something, you found out and you got back to us in a timely manner *every single time*. And that's so much appreciated. It makes everything else that we have to do a pleasure. The same thing going for research work. When we needed information for research work (I) really appreciated the fact that would delve in and get that information turned around back to us quickly so we could go on ahead and do our things. And I understand that planners and directors have enormous work loads so I know that you were putting extra time in doing those things for all of us and thank you so much. And we're going to miss you big time.

Ms. Ruether: I won't be too far!

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay.

Commissioner Hughes: And one more – thank you for your time with Skagit County.

Chair Raschko: Are you saying you're going to keep coming to our meetings? Is that –
(much laughter)

Ms. Ruether: I won't miss that!

Chair Raschko: Jen, do you have anything?

Commissioner Hutchison: I just want to thank you for having me remotely this evening.

Chair Raschko: Well, we enjoyed it. Okay. Well, thank you, everybody. Have a good evening. We'll be adjourned (gavel).