

## Skagit County 2026 Docket - Public Comment Summary Matrix

*Disclaimer: Skagit County has reviewed all public comments submitted regarding the proposed 2026 Docket. The table below provides a high-level summary of the comments received and includes additional context and explanations to help inform the Planning Commission as they evaluate comments and make a recommendation to the Skagit County Board of County Commissioners. This summary is provided for informational purposes only and does not represent final decisions or policy actions.*

| Comment # | Comment Summary                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1         | Party of Record: Requests the definition be revised to clearly align with RCW 36.70B.130, ensuring that anyone who requests notice or submits substantive comments before a decision is considered a Party of Record and receives notice of the decision and appeal rights. | RCW 36.70B.130 requires a notice of decision be sent to “to any person who, prior to the rendering of the decision, [1] requested notice of the decision or [2] submitted substantive comments on the application.” Part 4 of the proposed Party of Record definition includes everyone that would satisfy the first condition of Section 130. Parts 1 and 3 include everyone who would satisfy the second condition. |
| 1         | Type 1 Review Notice: Recommends amending SCC 14.06.150 Table 1 to require notice of Type 1 decisions when administrative appeal rights are available, so Parties of Record have a meaningful opportunity to file an appeal within the required timeframe.                  | The notice given for Type 1 decision is not being amended. All Type 1 decisions are provided the notice required by law. Requiring public notice for all Type 1 permits, including building permits, would create an administrative burden that the County does not have the resources to support.                                                                                                                    |
| 11        | Clarify that party-of-record status and appeal standing are established through timely written comments or testimony. Recommend striking proposed subsection #4 or clarifying that requesting a copy of a decision does not, by itself, establish standing to appeal.       | Subsection 4 of the Party of Record definition was added to provide a clearer opportunity for appeal of Type 1 applications which do not have a comment period.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

| <b>Comment #</b>    | <b>Comment Summary</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <b>Response</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>13</b>           | Requests clarification of the “official public comment period” and provide opportunities for public comment following public hearings.                                                                                                  | Public comments are governed by SCC 14.06.340. The Hearing Examiner, under SCC 14.06.370, is required to accept comments at the hearing and is allowed to extend the public comment period if needed. These sections are not being amended.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>2</b>            | Opposes the RVR-to-SSB rezone due to traffic safety, existing commercial activity, outdoor storage, and compatibility with surrounding residential, agricultural, and school uses.                                                      | The proposed rezone is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and applicable rural development policies. The property has been historically used for small-scale business and will not create any additional impact that does not already exist.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>3,7.1, 7.2,8</b> | Concerns about the access to exiting mine and application materials indicated access is from Allen Road                                                                                                                                 | Application materials indicated existing access is from Allen Road in error. The existing mine is accessed from the existing driveway connecting to Old Highway 99. The applicant has clarified in submitted comments that a proposal for a future mine will utilize the existing access point to Old Highway 99 which will be reviewed at the time of Hearing Examiner Special Use.                                                                                                            |
| <b>3, 7.1, 12</b>   | Concerns include potential environmental impacts, increased noise and heavy truck traffic, impacts to drainage and flooding, impacts to the commenter’s private well, potential property-value impacts, and the need for road widening. | These concerns relate to future mining operations. The current proposal is limited to designation of parcels within the MRO. The designation does not approve a mining operation or establish the specific operating conditions, and those issues would be addressed through subsequent permitting and environmental review.                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>7.1, 12</b>      | Concerns about Residential gross density proximity to MRO.                                                                                                                                                                              | <p>Comprehensive Plan Policy 4D-1.3(b) supports MRO lands are in areas with surrounding land uses that have a maximum <u>designated</u> density of one residence per 10 acres. The highest designated density in the area is one residence per 10 acres, which is the Rural Reserve zone.</p> <p>The nearest non-applicant residence is approximately 530 feet from the property boundary. With the required 100-foot buffer under SCC 14.52.050(3)(c), active operations would be at least</p> |

| Comment # | Comment Summary                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 630 feet from the residence. Proposed parcels to be in the MRO are not within ¼-mile of Rural Villages, the Rural Intermediate (RI) zone, or any Urban Growth Area (UGA).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 8         | Comment concerning the use of Policy 4D-1.1(b), noting the site's estimated 674,000–899,000 cubic yards are below the 1,000,000-cubic-yard threshold.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | The applicant estimates that the site contains between 674,000 and 899,000 cubic yards of aggregate resource, equivalent to approximately 1,011,000 to 1,348,000 tons (assuming 1.5 tons per cubic yard). Although the estimated volume is below the 1,000,000-cubic-yard threshold for establishing a new Mineral Resource Overlay (MRO), the request involves expanding an existing MRO and an existing gravel mining operation rather than designating a new standalone area. The combined MRO area would therefore exceed 1,000,000 cubic yards of resource and is consistent with criterion (b) of Policy 4D-1.1. |
| 8         | Concern raised about the “mapping error” claim is inconsistent with the County’s documented parcel history. Three parcels were never designated MRO, and two were removed during the 2005–2007 Comprehensive Plan update. The 2007 adopted map shows none of the five parcels within the MRO, indicating the request is for a new designation rather than a correction of a mapping error. | Two of the five parcels were designated MRO and were removed after a comprehensive review of MRO in 2007. Staff were unable to find documentation demonstrating why the two parcels were removed from the MRO designation.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 13        | Comment for SEPA review address site reclamation after resource depletion, including potential impacts and hazards to adjacent properties.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | If the MRO designation is approved, future mining activities would require a Hearing Examiner Special Use Permit and applicable SEPA review. Reclamation, site restoration, and potential impacts or hazards to adjacent properties would be evaluated during the project-level permitting and environmental review process. Neighboring property owners would receive notice of the                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |

| <b>Comment #</b> | <b>Comment Summary</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | <b>Response</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | development application, public hearing, and SEPA determination as part of the Special Use Permit process.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>12</b>        | Concern the legal status of the lots and not meeting the Platting process.                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | The MRO designation does not create, alter, or legalize individual lots. A lot of certification application will be required to be submitted with the Hearing Examiner Special Use permit.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>4,5</b>       | Comment concerning about allowing data centers of any size in Skagit County and about impacts on farmland, water, salmon, clean air, Native communities, and the overall character of Skagit County.                                                                                                     | The proposed code limits data centers to 2,000 square feet and 2 megawatts and allows them only as accessory server rooms or in the Bayview Ridge Light- and Heavy-Industrial zones. Future projects would remain subject to applicable permitting and environmental review requirements.                                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>9</b>         | Comment is about the maximum number of data centers that could be developed in the Bayview Ridge area and their cumulative impacts on the environment and infrastructure. Suggestion to establish a limit on the total number of data centers permitted in the area.                                     | The proposed amendment does not establish a maximum number of data centers in Bayview Ridge. It establishes size and location standards for the use. Project-specific impacts would be reviewed through applicable permitting and environmental review. The proposed restrictions on size and power consumption would make data centers as a primary use infeasible and the use would likely only be utilized to support businesses as an accessory use. |
| <b>13</b>        | Requests additional requirements addressing fire, flooding, catastrophic events, fire suppression, and continuation of the use following transfer or sale.                                                                                                                                               | The Bayview Ridge industrial zones are located outside of the 100-year floodplain. All development in Skagit County reviewed for compliance with the International Fire Code.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| <b>13</b>        | Off-Premises Signs: Requests that existing GMA compliance requirements and prior settlement provisions for rural signage be retained, including restrictions limiting billboards to Rural Freeway Service (RFS) zones and established standards for sign size, height, setbacks, spacing, and placement. | The proposed amendments are limited to requiring side and rear setbacks for billboards. Staff will continue reviewing this comment and may bring a future amendment at a later time.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |

| Comment # | Comment Summary                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 14        | <p>Supports allowing larger data centers in Skagit County's industrial and manufacturing zones rather than limiting them to 2 MW/2,000 square feet and Bayview Ridge. Requests consideration of larger facilities through additional industrial zones or a discretionary review process.</p> <p>Supports standards for noise, setbacks, landscaping, traffic, water use, and viewshed.</p> <p>Notes potential tax revenue, jobs, and economic benefits and states that existing state environmental regulations would address many project impacts.</p> | <p>The proposed code amendment limits all data centers to 2,000 square feet and limits their power consumption to 2 MWs. It is unclear if Skagit County has electrical grid capacity or water availability to support larger data centers.</p> |