

**Skagit County Planning Commission  
Work Session: Agritourism  
October 10, 2023**

**Planning**

**Commissioners:** Kathy Mitchell  
Vince Henley  
Amy Hughes  
Tim Raschko, Chair  
Joe Woodmansee  
Tammy Candler Vice Chair  
Martha Rose  
Jen Hutchinson

**Staff:** Jack Moore, Planning Director  
Sarah Ruether, Senior Planner

**Public**

**Commenters:** Anthony Romano

Chair Tim Raschko: (gavel) Good evening and welcome to the October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission. It appears we have everybody present. So I would ask for a motion to approve the minutes from September 12<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Martha Rose: So moved.

Commissioner Vince Henley: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to approve the minutes. Is there discussion of the minutes?

(silence)

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

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: All opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, that passes. Thank you.

Tonight we're going to have Public Remarks. This time on the agenda is an opportunity for anybody to speak to the Planning Commission about any topic except scheduled items on our agenda. So that discludes (sic) talking about ag tourism. This is not part of the formal participation process for any development regulation or Comprehensive Plan amendment project. We're

limited to three minutes per speaker and we'll have 15 minutes total. So is there anybody who wishes to speak?

Yes, sir? If you'd come up to the podium here and give your name and address.

Anthony Romano: How you doing? Anthony Romano.

Chair Raschko: Excuse me, though, please. Please remember that we have a three-minute limit.

Mr. Romano: Right. I will.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Mr. Romano: Anthony Romano. I live at 53553 Shular Road. There's been a issue with my property. A thing that people keep changing things on my government description without my knowledge. \$60,000 taken off of my property value because someone's changing the agricultural thingie or whatever. And we're trying to figure it all out. And that man right there knows all about it and so does Lisa Janicki. And fraudulent. They're falsifying documents, they're trying to criminalize me. They've got the police – Skagit County police, Sheriff's Department. The Sedro-Woolley police department yesterday did a – tried to unlawfully pull me over. That's Lisa Janicki's little militia she's got going. And it's all over my hundred-year-old spring that Skagit County wants because they want to get back the Kirkland account, bottled water, and gather their 32 million dollars a year they plan on making off of it in revenue.

So I've been thrown in jail twice now unlawfully. They won't give me records. They've been hiding records from me for I don't know how long. Giving me the runaround when they know all about it. And I've got right in my backpack the original homestead contract. So they've already working with Department of Ecology, Terry Gillingham. Have thwarted a plan to steal the spring and develop the area, put in a water tank – whatever they were going to do. But they're doing it the wrong way. Debra Able – I'm working with Debra Able, the real estate broker/slash/developer/slash/pathological liar, like with half of these people that are probably here. It's disgusting. I mean, it's truly disgusting and I'm going to prove that everyone of the s\*\*\* that they did to me. Got, you know, a code enforcement. Anybody have any problem with the code enforcement guy, Tom Wenzel? Because I already read they already got problems with the code enforcement. They already know it. Because they're going to give me an educational visit. That's what he said in one of his **ERTs** – what do you call them? Whatever the emails between each other, the co-workers, which I've got right in there. They're going to pay me an educational

–  
(sound of timer)

Mr. Romano: – visit, which was talking about the cops.

Chair Raschko: I'm sorry, sir. Your time is up.

Mr. Romano: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you.

Mr. Romano: And then you will be exposed. Period. This is going on YouTube, so good luck

Chair Raschko: Does anybody else wish to speak?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Is there anybody on Zoom that would like –

Sarah Ruether: Raise your hand if you're on Zoom and you'd like to speak, or unmute if you're on Zoom and you'd like to speak. It looks like there's – no, I'm not seeing anybody.

Chair Raschko: Yes, please?

Unidentified Male Voice in the Audience: Yeah, there's no discussion on the agritourism. Is that correct?

Chair Raschko: That's correct. Okay, nobody on Zoom so thank you. That will end Public Remarks and we'll move on to our main agenda item tonight, which is our Work Session to Discuss Public Comment on the Agricultural Advisory Board Proposed Agritourism Code Changes. So, Jennifer? Sorry.

Ms. Ruether: Good evening. I'm Sarah Ruether, a senior planner. I will present the public comments on the Agricultural Advisory Board's proposed agritourism code changes tonight. To give a sense of the process, we are at the – we had two work sessions, one in April and then one in June, on these proposed code recommendations. Then we had a hearing on July 25<sup>th</sup> and now we're presenting the comments \_\_ on the hearing and that were received during the comment period. And all the supporting documents can be found on our website at Skagit County Departments Planning and Permit Agritourism main dot.hcm.

So the comment period lasted from July 19<sup>th</sup> to August 17<sup>th</sup>.

(male voice speaking loudly in the background)

Ms. Ruether: There was – well, actually it was July 6<sup>th</sup>. That is an error on the PowerPoint so I'll note that on the top. There was a staff report and the DNS, Determination of Non-Significance, was published to the website. It was published to the Skagit Valley *Herald* and sent to the listserv and emailed on the 6<sup>th</sup> of July. And that opened the public comment period. We had the public hearing on the 25<sup>th</sup> and then the Planning Commission voted to extend the comment period, so we extended it to August 17<sup>th</sup> and we noticed that extension of the comment period. And so the comments presented, the rest of this presentation, are from that comment period.

So the total comments was 1,367. After the comment period there were 21 incomplete comments; 151 comments not from Skagit County; 36 – that doesn't include the Save Skagit Venues – with multiple viewpoints – seven; one comment discussing conservation easements; 52 comments – public verbal comments, public hearing testimony; three comments on farmstands; two comments on fairness; one comment, which was opposed to the SEPA determination; 23 comments which asked for more time; 57 comments opposed that did not include the Save Skagit Venues; 25 comments in support; and then Save Skagit Venues had 646 comments that were *in* Skagit County and 342 that were *outside* of Skagit County.

So I'm just going to go through them. There were 15 attachments to the staff report so I will go through each attachment and try to cover all the comments, the substance of the comments in each one.

So the first attachment was the comments in support. There were 25 written comments, seven hearing testimony. The organizations that commented were Friends of Skagit County, the Agricultural Advisory Board, and the Western Washington Agricultural Association.

The issues brought up were not wanting faux farms; some grandfathering okay; would like to maintain strong agricultural zoning; not fair for unpermitted events that don't follow the law; requests for enforcement; comments that events don't belong in Ag-NRL; comments about existing event centers not permitted; that farmers receive a tax discount because it's important to society; that it's an Open Space Natural Resource Land designation; unfair for event centers to get this discounted rates; without restrictions, tourism will take over farming.

Other comments about safety issues for unpermitted venues and events. This is fire and traffic issues, building issues. Liability issues for farmers with people trespassing from events on their property concerned that this proposal is so wide-reaching it would limit the Tulip Festival or farm events. The proposed code would not limit the Tulip Festival, was the Department response to that. Understand that farms may need to supplement income but don't think that event centers are the way to do it. Food security is an issue for society and we need to help farmers survive and thrive, and is therefore in support of the proposed code. And these proposals contribute to food security.

Other issues in these comments was – were concerned about lawsuits and negative public perception for farmers. And reporting requirements that already threaten farmers' livelihoods. Farmers already have that kind of threat. They were in support of finding a way to bring legal businesses into compliance with regular review and permitting. There were comments about permit holders would then be liable for damage, harassment, distress, or loss of production caused by events. And comments about permitting fees contributing to Farmland Legacy. Some comments about wedding venues being a trend and worrying that we would have a loss of farmland for a passing trend. A comment about commercial activity should go in commercial zones.

Other comments that are saying it's a quality of life issue. They don't want extra traffic and noise. Comments that think that these kinds of events make housing problems worse by having people turn their homes into temporary rentals for event patrons. Worried about a loss of farmland from saltwater buffers and other threats and therefore these regulations are needed to protect farmers. Infrastructure in Ag-NRL zone does not support event centers, septic, parking, road capacity. Some comments said local businesses are not hired for these events – photographers, et cetera, coming from Seattle and other places.

Comments don't want agritourism to support just any enterprise; therefore, in support. One comment: As a founding member of Farmland Legacy Program and a former member of the Agricultural Advisory Board believes that nonagricultural activities interfere with the right to farm. One commenter lives next to an event venue and says that the heavy bass disturbs her calves who huddle in a corner when the loud music is played and that the sheriff has been contacted on numerous occasions. And there were comments that the proposed definition of agritourism is supported by existing code.

Other comments: The notion of good and bad actors is moot because you can't guarantee behavior, and that is why there is a regulatory framework to keep everyone honest and fair. In their opinion, venues that were never legal cannot be grandfathered. Non-agricultural activities would be harder to rein in if there were endless possibilities and it is driven by economic rationale for income. Agriculture may not be as profitable, but you can't eat agritourism or get the land back

if developed. Without protection, the agricultural economy will weaken in Skagit County. Owners of Ag-NRL buildings have gone around the system to make a fortune without paying permit fees, taxes, and not having safety considered.

So that's – those were – and then I will go into the organizations that commented in support, which – Friends of Skagit County commented in support. They would like the public to have more information about the GMA and laws that support the preservation of Ag-NRL. They would also like the County to enforce existing regulations whether or not proposed code changes are adopted. They would like the public to know the history of Skagit County's protection of Ag-NRL and would like the public to understand the cumulative effects of non-agricultural uses and how that can endanger farm preservation and productivity.

The Agricultural Advisory Board commented that the County needs to define agritourism and clarify the code, and they believe this proposal does that and supports the changes. Also concerned without protection from tourism uses these uses will overtake the agriculture uses and we can be Skagit County's agricultural economy.

The Western Washington Agricultural Association commented in support of the proposed code changes with a few recommended changes. They would like to amend Skagit County Code 14.16.900(2)(h) to add criterion for special use permits. All events must be accessory to agricultural use on working farms; (b) events must support the sale of products and food grown on a working farm. At least 50% of products sold must be from the farm; events may occur on no more than 12 calendar days per year. All permits subject to annual review. Permit holders must be onsite during events to monitor activities and uphold standards. If any structures, spaces, or septic infrastructure was created for a temporary event, it must be removed once the permit is no longer active and the land returned to original state with no farmable land loss. Proper traffic maintenance plan for the event must be approved by the County 30 days prior to the permit activation and must have minimal impact on the surrounding neighborhoods.

They also want “events must include a plan to keep visitors restricted to their property and guarantee zero impact, physical or other, on neighboring properties. This plan must be approved by the County 30 days prior to permit activation. Permit holders would then be financially liable for damages, harassment, distress, or loss of production on neighboring properties during the event caused by any intrusion of event attendees, hosts, or vendors.” They also recommended that Skagit – that the Skagit right-to-farm ordinance be included in the special use contract with the permit holder and the permit holder held accountable to reading and the ordinance. They also recommended fees for permits and fines for violators, to be used for an enforcement program. The Department response is to submit this proposal for the annual docket.

So those were the comments in support and I will go on to comments in opposition.

Chair Raschko: Excuse me, Sarah. Would it be a good idea to have questions on that section at this point in time?

Ms. Ruether: Sure.

Chair Raschko: Because by the time, I think, we get to the end a lot will be lost. So has anybody any questions for staff, or comments?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Ruether: Okay. So this is Attachment 2 on the Staff Report. There were 57 written comments, 19 hearing testimony. The organizations that commented were Skagit's Best Salsa Company, Christianson's Nursery, Boldly Grown Farm, Double Barrel BBQ, Samish Bay Cheese, Garden Path Fermentation, Skagit Tulip Festival, the Mount Vernon Chamber of Commerce, and the Skagit Agritourism Stakeholder Group.

Some of the issues brought up: whether these event businesses are important to the community; that this can be a win-win; that this provides economic resilience and preservation of agricultural heritage and local business support, and community pride. The face of agriculture in Skagit County is changing and a different path is needed. A compromise is needed to give some of these uses a legal path. We need a process for farms that have agritourism operations to come into compliance. Would like to see complimentary agritourism for small and medium-size farms. Concern with the economic fallout and wonders if an economic impact analysis has been done. Would like survey results considered. Wonders if this is small farms versus large farms. Would like agritourism regulations to encourage the growth of small businesses. Would like the growing role of agritourism considered in the economy. Concerned about the negative impacts.

I think the only Department response – the Department responses are kind of mixed in. It was that the survey was not statistically significant so it can't necessarily be used as a measure of public support. It was used more as a tool of public outreach. So that 68% can't be read as 68% of Skagit County necessarily.

Other written comments: They oppose the code because it's too extreme. They would like wedding planners to enforce contracts. I think the Department response to that is the County does not have authority over a wedding contract. That's not something under our regulatory authority. They were concerned that the proposed code would drive out small business owners, and they would like more public engagement and involvement to find a collaborative solution. Preservation of farmland should not be at the cost of small farm owners nor should it favor larger farming operations. You could preserve small farms with more economic diversity. Concern that the proposed regulations will make it – will *not* make it possible to maintain the property and will diminish the value of the property because of the loss of economic opportunity. Concern that changing the number of events from 24 to 12 is based on subjective whims rather than studies. Concern about corporate takeover is small. Farms cannot survive without agritourism. Resents the restrictive language and objects to restrictions on the land beyond what is already restricted by zoning.

Concerns about loss of income and would like to see fines or other enforcement for bad actors. They suggest there should be solutions for bad behavior rather than not having agritourism. It should be permitted as part of liberty and freedom. Farming has changed in the last 50 years and this new income from agritourism is needed for preservation and small farms for more diverse income. They suggest using noise regulations and enforcing them for problems and does not like arbitrary rules and arbitrary number of events allowed/permitted. Visitors from events on farmlands stay in local hotels and support other businesses and therefore are good for the economy. They would like Skagit County to look at Italy as an example, and thinks there is no vision in limiting a farm to agriculture. Would like a compromise because they think that small farms are important to our future. Restriction of events will have a negative effect on the economy and they would like to see other events except for large concerts, and they – this commenter thought that was too big.

There were concerns about the release of the proposed code changes during harvest time, making it more difficult for farmers to participate. Extra money for ag tourism allows for historical preservation of farm buildings. A business owner has catered hundreds of weddings in Skagit County and they're worried this will negatively impact their business. Would like to see agritourism, if needed, to set some limits on it. They would like to see agritourism and, if needed, set limits on non-agricultural improvements part of this. Concerned about the wording of the proposal and do not like that it has to be an active farm. Thinks Skagit County has allowed farming excessive influence in political process and that we need income from more than farming, and to recognize the prime location of Skagit between Seattle and Vancouver, B.C.

Samish Bay Cheese has seen the benefits of agritourism to small and medium farms and thinks there needs to be consensus on better policy. Thinks the proposed code changes would take away from those things that are special in Skagit County. Thinks that the Planning Commission and Agricultural Advisory Board should pay more attention to the survey done and does not think there's anything beautiful about an active farm. Thinks the conflicts between the events and working farms are overblown. Thinks large farms don't get permits either so it is not fair to blame event venues. Thinks the proposed code changes are a government overreach and shortsighted to restrict farmers, and they cited freedom and the Declaration of Independence. They don't want events limited because of the economy and they wonder if these code changes have been studied for their effect on the economy or ecology. And I think the Department response is that a SEPA analysis was done for the environmental impacts so it does not include economic impacts. Agritourism is important to the economy, especially communities east of Highway 9, and they urge the Planning Commission to take more time and get this right even if it takes longer. Believe these event venues foster a sense of community. They would like to – I think that's supposed to be "pose" – their own suggestions for code changes. Think farmers deal with unfounded complaints and there needs to be better forms and a way to take complaints. Concern that proposed code changes would have a chilling effect on the Tulip Festival. Need to allow people to be entrepreneurs. Farmers in a venue need to learn how to coexist. Need more time to find a middle ground. Many weddings are small micro-weddings, and this should be considered.

Skagit County is lacking in large event spaces and as an artist these spaces are needed to support the makers' community. Thinks we don't have food security issues and thinks opposition to agritourism is hypocritical because people attend these events. Do not think this proposal contributes to the greater good. And they think that it's already hard enough to have a small business and that this would make it harder. Times change and rules and regulations should change with the times to include new industries like the wedding industry.

Some of the Department responses that this survey was not statistically significant and can't be extrapolated to public support, and also there were comments about suggesting new regulations, and the Department encouraged any group or individuals that had specific code proposals to submit them as part of the docket. The deadline for the submittals is the last business day of July. And the code changes will not change any allowances for farmstands. And the intent of the proposed code was not to eliminate the Tulip Festival or other farm festivals. And zoning is restrictive. It's purpose is to separate conflicting uses and work toward a common vision for the future. And some of the comments about zoning made comments that the SEPA analysis was done and a determination of non-significance was made, so there was no significant environmental impacts determined. And the Agricultural Advisory Board wanted the requirement of an active farm because they're concerned if it's more profitable to do events this would cause farming operations to cease or lessen and therefore would be a loss of productive agricultural lands and soils. The arbitrary number of events was chosen with the rationale of assuring that any event business income would be smaller than that of the working farm.

For some of the comments they said the proposed regulations would not impact wedding venues that are not in Ag-NRL. No agritourism examples from other countries were considered as part of this proposal. And Skagit County cannot regulate how private businesses ensure good behavior from their patrons. I gave reference to where noise is regulated in our code, talked a little bit about how zoning restricts uses to prevent conflicts between different land uses and to preserve natural resource lands from being developed into non-resource lands. Skagit County has a long history of using zoning and GMA to protect farmland. Forty-acre lot minimums is an example. The vision of Skagit County has been to protect and limit farmland from non-agricultural uses. If there were no zoning laws, it might likely – much of our farmland we have today would not be preserved. Zoning and development regulation, as part of comprehensive planning, contribute to big picture community vision, which I do realize is different for different people. So that statement is ambiguous purposely.

Okay, any discussion on that?

Chair Raschko: Any questions on Attachment 2?

Commissioner Joe Woodmansee: I have a question.

Chair Raschko: Please, Joe.

Commissioner Woodmansee: When you talked about that the survey or whatever you want to call it that was done was insignificant – because of the size, I'm assuming?

Ms. Ruether: It's not statistically significant. To have a statistically significant survey it would have – you would have had to have random sample size. It would have required a lot more time and work, and it was before I even got here, but the decision was made not to do that because it was much more expensive and they didn't think it was – you wouldn't have been able to reach out to as many people. Because whenever you do a statistically significant survey it has to be a random sample, and the sample survey was not random. It was whoever answered it that got it in their mailboxes. But it was a way to let everyone know that we were working on agritourism.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay, so are you saying that when we sent that out that that was of no use?

Ms. Ruether: I'm not saying that. I'm saying it was a planneresque use, not a scientific use. It was more for public – that why I said “public involvement” – to get people involved. But the numbers cannot be scientifically used. They have no confidence levels. If it was a statistically significant survey, you'd have confidence levels, you'd have a statistician doing it, and none of that was done. So it was used more for a soft public involvement purpose rather than to be an accurate sample of opinions.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So it seems like that we're downplaying that now when we were up-playing it at the beginning of the process. Like at the beginning of the process this was this great thing – tool that we had and we were seeing information from it. Now we're downplaying it like it just – it has no significance, which to me doesn't – I mean, it doesn't fly, to be honest with you. I *think* that we did a second one. If I remember right, we sent out a second deal, and didn't we send it to, like, a huge amount of people the second time? It wasn't *us* – staff?

Ms. Ruether: Yeah, the second one was sent to everyone in unincorporated – I wasn't here for the first one. The second one we sent postcards to everyone in unincorporated Skagit County.



Commissioner Woodmansee: Everybody that lives in the county?

Ms. Ruether: Yes. And doesn't live in a city, who lives in unincorporated.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yes. And not – I mean, and the result of that is the opinion that it was an insignificant result?

Ms. Ruether: I mean, you know, it can't be – it's not scientific because it's not controlled of who responds to it. It's not a random sample. It's – you know, I guess you could argue that maybe it wasn't the best to public – I know the survey was very controversial. It wasn't the best way to let people know we were working on this. There's always different ways to reach out to the public so that was the choice that was made at the time.

Commissioner Woodmansee: What do you mean it wasn't random?

Ms. Ruether: I'm trying to remember my statistics class –

Commissioner Woodmansee: I mean, it's not really a poll, right? You're asking for comments.

Ms. Ruether: Well, I mean, people who responded were probably people who had really strong feelings about agritourism. To have a random survey, you would have to – it's like political polling – you'd have to choose a number randomly and then call it and get their opinion for it to be statistically significant for that population size. And you'd have confidence levels based on your sample size of how much that – whether that was accurate representation of the public. And you can do those. They're just a lot more expensive to do.

Commissioner Woodmansee: All right. I have other questions but I don't know that it's, you know, going to be much of a benefit. That one just struck me like we're just writing off all this effort and like it has, you know, very little meaning to the process. And it was quite a bit of effort and it cost a few dollars. I don't know how much, but....

Chair Raschko: Did you have something, Jen?

Commissioner Jen Hutchinson: Well, I believe you've already clarified. I was just going to ask if, in recollection, every single resident was invited to participate within the county – non-city members – and you did. So every county resident was invited to participate and we've got those results, how ever random they may be, but it's not statistical. Okay.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead, Vince.

Commissioner Henley: Yeah, we talked a lot about what this *isn't*, but let's talk about what it *is* for a second. It's a perfectly valid sample for the opinions of the people who responded to the survey. What you can't do is you can't extrapolate it to the general population because of the various things you mention. It's not a random sample, okay, it's not controlled, and so on. So there is a difference. But in terms of the purposes of the Planning Commission as a barometer for those people in the county who were involved with agritourism and farming, it's a perfectly valid expression of their opinion.

Ms. Ruether: Mm-hmm. And we got a lot of comments. I mean, I think the responses were, I think, just around 600 responses, which is pretty good for – you know, when you do surveys like that I don't respond most of the time, to be honest. And beyond that we had places where people

could put comments in and we got a lot of people giving, you know, detailed comments when there was, like, a blank space in the survey to give your opinions about things. So it did come back like a pretty hefty document with a lot of opinions. So in that sense it really did engage people.

Chair Raschko: Anything else? Yes?

Commissioner Kathy Mitchell: I can't let this one go. Okay, so we were talking about survey samples and things like that. I tried taking the survey – not to turn it in; I just wanted to see what it was like so I knew what the questions were and how the thing flowed. And I got kicked out and kicked out and kicked out, and my answers never were stayed and I talked to you guys about that, especially when we had just a little more time where we could have extended it but there was really no purpose in extending it. But speaking scientifically, no, it's not a statistical or scientific process. It's opinion for people going in and it's not a randomized study speaking scientifically or statistically. What it was was reaching out and however many people saw that and responded, and so it's no different than saying Come Tuesday night at six o'clock and give your opinion. You get who you get and whoever's – word of mouth goes to word of mouth. The same thing happened with the survey.

The other thing: This is my own personal opinion and not to be compared to anybody else's. But I thought – and I've heard this from other people, though. When I read the questions and went from 1 to 2 to 3, most of the survey was leading to have agritourism period. The whole thing was leading. And other people recognized that as well. That's fine for people that want to do it, but that's not scientific. It's not anything else other than it was to get the discussion going. And the same thing as when the County did some sessions on the first survey and then followed up with – it might have been WSU; I've forgotten. There were three sets of meeting and they weren't very well attended but people got to talk. That's what this was about. The survey initiated conversation and awareness about the ag tourism. That's all it is. It is not statistically significant. That's what they mean.

Chair Raschko: Anything else? Yes, Jen?

Commissioner Hutchison: I just have a question. Is there any SEPA study, activity, or reports to-date on these active event venues as far as what impacts they're having as establishments, even though they may or may not legally be operating?

Ms. Ruether: I mean, there'll only be a SEPA if they've come in to get permits.

Commissioner Hutchison: So there's not –

Ms. Ruether: If they haven't come in to get permits, nobody's done SEPA.

Commissioner Hutchison: You don't know what the impacts are really.

Ms. Ruether: Yeah.

Commissioner Hutchison: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Ruether: Comments requesting more time: There were 22 written comments. There were 18 comments in the hearing testimony. Organizations commenting was Boldly Grown Farms, Willowbrook Manor, Bow Hill Blueberries, Samish Bay Cheese, Skagit Tourism Bureau, La Conner Gardens, and Blanchard Mountain Farms. The issues brought up was a request for more time and more stakeholder engagement; more time to find a way for these businesses to coexist; requesting more time because these are issues that will affect generations to come; the volume of comments indicates that this proposal misses the mark and need more time to work on this. The Skagit Tourism Bureau would like more time to ensure that policy decisions do not provide unfair advantage to any individual or group. Policies should allow entrepreneurs to have businesses that align with Skagit's identity and complement farming. We need more time to find a middle ground.

I think that's – do you want any comments on that?

Chair Raschko: Any comments, questions?

(silence)

Ms. Ruether: Attachment 4, Opposed to SEPA. There was one written comment from Maplehurst Farm. They believe that staff did not sufficiently analyze the impacts per requirements of SEPA and would like economic impacts studied and comprehensive analysis and mitigation measures. The Department response is that SEPA does not evaluate economic impacts. A determination of non-significance was made by the SEPA official, the director, and if you make a determination of non-significance there's no comprehensive analysis or mitigation measures. Only if there's a determination of significance then you have alternatives and propose mitigation. So it did not rise to the level to warrant that.

Fairness – oh, did we want any discussion of that? Sorry.

Chair Raschko: Have we any questions or comments?

(silence)

Ms. Ruether: There were two written comments that had kind of the theme of fairness. Organization commenting, Lisser and Associates. There were concerns about the code being addressed equally and equitably, concerns about how to draw the line fairly between incidental and subordinate, and concern that there would be unintended consequences if these proposed code changes are adopted and would like the code applied fairly to all businesses because if they are not applied fairly then they're not meaningful. There was concerns – also another comment was concerns about the methodology used for both BERK surveys – believe that the question in BERK's survey were biased in their design. Also believes that the sample size was inadequate. And the Department responds that this was more of a tool for public outreach and not statistically significant.

Any comments on that?

Chair Raschko: Comments or questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Ruether: There were three written comments about farmstands. Also Lisser and Associates was an organization that commented on this: Concern that proposed code changes would limit farmstands. The Department response was the proposed code changes would not change any allowances for farmstands.

Chair Raschko: Everybody okay?

Several Commissioners: Mm-hmm.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Ms. Ruether: Attachment 7 was Economics. I put this one together afterwards so a lot of these comments it's hard to try to put things in different buckets because a lot of them address lots of different issues. But in kind of pulling all this together we did notice the theme of economics. So their comments are repeats from other sections – just FYI. And there were 29 written comments that we addressed this. Organizations commenting was Skagit's Best Salsa, Garden Path Fermentation, Rose and Sparrow Floral Designs, and Maplehurst Farm. And for economics, there were also economics comments from both in support and opposed. It's also a bucket that mixes different – it depends on how you perceive it. So I'll just say that upfront before I kind of discuss it, but when I say "economics" it means different things to different people in the comments.

So some of the written comment issues were that non-agriculture activities will be harder to rein in if we open the window to allow more uses and possibilities and if the possibilities are endless if driven by economic rationale – needing more income. Agriculture might not be the most profitable use but that is even more reason to protect it because you can't eat agritourism or get the land back that had been developed. Without protection of the agricultural economy – without protection, the agricultural economy will weaken in Skagit County. Land speculation of value would be higher if commercial uses are allowed, which would make buying land and farming harder to enter. So those were kind of the economics that were in support and then there were economics in opposition – that agritourism allows for economic resilience; agritourism helps small businesses; and family farms are not sustainable if they can't have events. They need their income to preserve barns, and concerns about the hospitality industry for weddings in Skagit County. The agriculture industry does not have the economic ability to generate an economy capable to meet the needs of the county as a whole, and that Skagit County should take advantage of its location between Seattle and Vancouver.

That's all for Economics.

Chair Raschko: Questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Go ahead.

Ms. Ruether: Attachment 8 was Conservation Easements. We had one written comment. The issue or the suggestion was that conservation easement agreements should be created to allow for unlimited agritourism as long as farming is the primary use. They think that the Conservation Futures Advisory Board should create and amend easements which allow agritourism and monitor it. And the Department response was that the Conservation Futures Board was not involved in any agritourism code or policy proposals.

Chair Raschko: Everybody fine on number 8?

(silence)

Ms. Ruether: Attachment 9 was Multiple Viewpoints. There were four written comments, eight hearing testimony. Organizations commenting was \_\_\_ S&B Farms. The issues for these written comments was a need to keep agriculture as a food producer viable. Important for food security and needs Skagit County to protect farmers and farming. Would like to see a compromise. I guess that's all for that.

Chair Raschko: Anything on number 9?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Ms. Ruether: Comments Outside of Skagit County is Attachment 10. There were 36 written comments and two people from the hearing testimony were outside of Skagit County. And this number does not include the Save Skagit Venues.

Incomplete Comments – this means they didn't give a – probably an – most likely an address. Something was missing. So there were 151 written comments and those can be viewed in Attachment 11. And this number also does not include the Save Skagit Venues.

Comments Received After the Deadline is Attachment 12. There are 23 written comments, so those comments can be viewed in Attachment 12. And this also does not include the Save Skagit Venues. Save Skagit Venues was nice enough to send me all their stuff in Excel so I really do appreciate that because Excel is much more easy to manipulate. So I, with the help of my amazing intern, was able to sort it and see how many were in Skagit County and were out of this pipe. The graph here is the signatures on the petition. Two-thousand one hundred thirty-four were from Skagit County residents and 3,507 were outside of Skagit County. And then the comments were also sorted according to address and there were 342 comments from outside of Skagit County. There were 631 comments inside Skagit County, so there was a total of 973 comments. And these comments can be viewed – the ones from Skagit County can be viewed in Attachment 13. I don't think we put the other ones in because it was just such a large volume of materials.

And to go over the content of them, the content of the Save Skagit Venues was kind of a repeat of the opposition. There were comments that would like to see wedding venues and event centers have a code path to be permitted in Skagit County. The comments were very similar to the other comments that opposed so I didn't go over those again, but you can view all of these comments in Attachment 13.

I also included a written request from Friends of Skagit County on July 21<sup>st</sup> to change or to remove the petition because it had violated change.org community policies by having misinformation on the website. Apparently the policies on change.org said they would remove the petition if it was found that the policies were violated. I don't think it ever was removed. I just wanted to note that the Department had no communication with change.org. There was some language on there that had some misinformation about farmstands, but we did not have any communication with change.org ourselves. Are there any questions on that?

Chair Raschko: Are there any questions or comments?

(silence)

Ms. Ruether: And then Attachment 14 is the Multi-Stakeholder Group. And this group is made up of businesses and it was formed to develop a counter-proposal collaboratively. Stakeholders in this group included Big Lake Trees & Events, Boldly Grown Farm, Christianson's Nursery, County Cousins, Eagle Haven Winery, Gordon Skagit Farms, Maplehurst Farm, Salt Box Barn, Skagit Tourism Bureau, Skagitonians to Preserve Farmland, Skagit Tulip Festival, Skagit Valley Wedding Rentals, Washington Bulb and RoozenGaarde, and Willowbrook Manor.

They recommend adding the following definition to Skagit County Code 14.04.020, Agritourism. "Agritourism is a commercial enterprise at a working farm, ranch, or other agricultural business for the enjoyment of visitors that generates supplemental income for the owners. Activities may involve education, entertainment, outdoor activities, hospitality, life events, farm events, food service, farm stays, or similar purpose. These activities link to and support the primary agriculture activity of the land and its economic viability. Agritourism activities are separate and distinct from farm-based businesses and agricultural support services."

Other definition they recommend adding is Farm Event Venue. This means an ongoing business operation at a privately-owned facility or site within an Ag-NRL zone for the purpose of hosting agritourism events or activities.

Another definition they would like added is Agricultural Support Services. Any non-agricultural use which is directly related to agriculture and directly dependent upon agriculture for its existence. These support services generally exist off-site and within districts that are intended to facilitate the production, marketing, and distribution of agricultural products. Agricultural support services are separate and distinct from farm-based businesses.

It's kind of a long proposal. Do you want me to stop in between it or just keep – continue?

Chair Raschko: What's everybody's wish?

Several Commissioners: Keep going.

Ms. Ruether: Keep going. Okay. Another definition they suggest adding is Farm-Based Business: "An on-farm commercial enterprise developed to the direct marketing of unprocessed or value-added soil-dependent agricultural products that are produced, processed, and sold onsite. Farm-based businesses are intended to supplement farm income, improve the efficiency of farming, and provide employment to farm family members. Farm-based businesses are separate and distinct from agricultural support services and Agritourism."

They recommend including agritourism as an agricultural accessory use subject to the following:

- Demonstration of farm income by IRS federal form E, F or equivalent. Agricultural lease income may be included per Skagit County implementation of 84.34 RCW, Open Space Taxation Act.
- Will not result in permanent conversion of farmland.
- Will not interfere with surrounding farm operations and practices.
- Agritourism activities are subject to Skagit County's right-to-farm ordinance.
- Will provide experience to visitors that promote and enhance Skagit County agriculture overall.

Recommends creating a limited entry permit system for farm event venues with a primary purpose of agritourism.

- Establish a cap on total number of permits available with preference for existing farm event venues.
- Limited entry farm event permits should be subject to renewal every 3 to 5 years.

Adding to permitted uses within Skagit County Code 14.16.400(2):

- Farm event venues serving no more than 25 persons for the primary purpose of providing educational classes, direct instruction, workshops, trainings, or similar uses that are directly related to onsite agricultural production.

Add as an administrative special use to Skagit County Code 14.16.400(3):

- Farm event venues serving up to 100 persons for the purpose of agritourism are subject to the following:
  - Events may occur no more than 24 days per year.
  - No new buildings can be built except when using the footprint of an existing building or from an existing foundation that is still intact.
  - A conservation easement with a binding site plan is placed on the subject parcel where the farm event venue is located.

They would also like to add a Hearing Examiner special use within Skagit County Code 14.16.400(4):

- Farm event venues serving more than 100 people and/or occurring more than 24 days for the purpose of agritourism subject to the following:
  - Events may occur more than 24 days per year as determined by the Hearing Examiner based on site-specific evaluation and if events do not create a detrimental level of electrical interference, line voltage fluctuation, noise, vibration, smoke, dust, odors, heat, glare, traffic, or other impact on the surrounding area.
  - No new buildings can be built except when using the footprints of an existing building or from an existing foundation that is intact.
  - A conservation easement with a binding site plan is placed on the subject parcel where the farm event venue would be located.

And the Department response was to encourage this group or any other organization to submit proposed code changes to the annual docket. The deadline for the submission is the last business day of July.

Chair Raschko: Questions? Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Right before this you said there was another letter that you had attached that was from Friends of Skagit County. Could you read through that one?

Ms. Ruether: Another – oh. With \_\_\_ or is that the one about the GMA stuff?

Commissioner Mitchell: I think it was the GMA one.

Ms. Ruether: I think I put that in the letters of support, so I think that's in Attachment 1. Yeah. I mean, Ellen's really good about citing all the GMA language for the support of preservation of farmland so she references that. Yeah.

Commissioner Mitchell: So was that one included with –

Ms. Ruether: That's in Attachment 1. This is a separate – this got its own attachment. I tried to give things that were different their own separate bins, but I do realize there's overlap between things.

Chair Raschko: Okay, anybody else? Yes, Joe, question?

Commissioner Woodmansee: In this last page that's still up here – so when I read this I come to this conclusion that the Department's response to the overall thing would move forward with what's already been proposed or minor changes to that, and then suggest that these people – that they submit their ideas next year to do this over again?

Ms. Ruether: Yeah, I mean, just because of – you know, when you guys deliberate – we're not there yet – if you majorly change what I've already noticed we do have to go through the process again. So anything that's different from what has already been noticed would have to be a new proposal. So –

Commissioner Woodmansee: So I'm sorry to interrupt you – I'm a little bit having a hard time grasping the fact that we've got everybody at the table now, the discussion's happening, and that we would actually finish one that a *lot* of people are unhappy with, and then invite us to start the process over again next year. That doesn't make sense to me.

Ms. Ruether: I mean, I'm just – there are – we allow people to make, you know, code proposals.

Commissioner Woodmansee: No, I understand.

Ms. Ruether: It doesn't necessarily mean that the Board would put it on their list of projects.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, so reading between the lines, if I was one of these people, I would say, you know Well, we're too late to the party so we're going to have to start this process all over again if we want these thoughts to be entertained.

Ms. Ruether: You know, a policy's an iterative process and so I think, you know, it's not something that's like it's something that's always refined and changed so that's why we make changes to our code and Comprehensive Plan every year. It's not written in stone. So I'm just trying to state the rules and not take anybody's side, so to speak.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Totally. And I'm just trying to point out what the effect of some of the comments are – right? The effect of this is all these things that they are suggesting wouldn't be considered right now and it would be a new process to consider them in the future. I just want, you know, everybody to be clear that that's what this is really saying.

Chair Raschko: If I may, it comes as no surprise to me because we actually voted to extend the comment period. And knowing that one of our fellow commissioners resigned so that he could participate in the process that would come up with a totally different concept that would require



us to start over, I don't see that starting over would necessarily be a bad thing – not that I'm recommending it at all. But, as Sarah said, sometimes it's got to be an iterative process.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Sure. I just wanted, you know, to get it clarified.

Unidentified Female Voice in the Audience: I couldn't hear what you said. Sometimes it's a *what* process?

Chair Raschko: *Iterative*.

Same Unidentified Female Voice: Pardon me?

Chair Raschko: *Iterative*. It means in steps or ongoing, multiple times. Am I right?

Ms. Ruether: Iterative: to go back and forth. When – something's iterative when it takes multiple times to get it right.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: I think Hutchinson was first.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead, Jen.

Commissioner Hutchinson: Just for clarification too, though, or elaboration, I suppose, no matter which way we go in deliberations on the current proposal we can still look at it again if it does reappear on our docket in the future. So it's good that the community's involved and the conversations are happening. The work is obviously being done so that's impressive. But it does absolutely make sense that it wouldn't be included in our upcoming deliberations on the existing code proposal that we've been discussing, right? It makes sense to me.

Chair Raschko: Did you have something?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes. Right on her coattails. Just so the general public knows, a lot of people are not aware of how the process happens, and sometimes it can be really slow or some years things seem to speed up. But the County does have to have deadlines when some things start. They're required by the state on when to start something, when to start something with the main Comprehensive Plan, and so they have to stick to deadlines. So we can't play with some things. That's one of the reasons why whatever the June – end of the June deadline was for one Comp Plan, there's for a reason. It's because something could be dragged on for forever needlessly or something can be done. And so that's when people keep saying "iterative" – is that sometimes things happen in steps, but regardless, if we were held to always stopping something because somebody said Well, wait a minute. I didn't know, they'd never get anything done. And so you have to have a starting point and an ending point and things do change. The number of years that I've been here I've seen things come up time and time again. I'm sure others have in other places. It's just the nature of the beast. So what's proposed and what's on the table is what's on the table. Next year is next year.

Chair Raschko: Anybody else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Ms. Ruether: And then lastly, Attachment 15 is all the public hearing testimony. The verbal testimony was translated into an attachment. There were seven speaking in support, there were 19 opposed, there were 18 asking for more time, and there were eight with multiple viewpoints, 52 comments with two commenters not residing in Skagit County. And our intern took this and put it into an attachment.

Commissioner Henley: Question.

Chair Raschko: Please.

Commissioner Henley: Do you know how many people took advantage of the more time request? It was a very common request. People wanted to have more time to submit their ideas and criticisms and whatnot. Do you know how many people actually came in in that window for more time?

Ms. Ruether: I did not. I don't know. I mean, you have to look at all the dates of everything. I mean, this is a lot more comments than most proposals.

Commissioner Henley: Was it a big number like the Chinese or was it a small number like Skagit County? Okay.

Commissioner Rose: Wasn't there on one of your charts a number of people that responded during the extension period? It was like 20-something.

Ms. Ruether: Oh, those were *beyond* the comment period.

Commissioner Rose: Oh, those are beyond the comment period? Oh, okay.

Ms. Ruether: Beyond the comment period, so they were not officially on the record but they were beyond the comment period. I don't know. I mean, there were a lot. I don't have the dates.

Commissioner Henley: I'm interested in the window that was granted at their request and how many people took advantage of it. That's all.

Chair Raschko: Jen?

Commissioner Hutchinson: I believe that last attachment that Sarah just read through came in after that timeframe – was all of the –

Commissioner Henley: And it just says it was a number of requests for more time. It doesn't say how many people actually used it.

Commissioner Hutchinson: That multiple stakeholder – I was watching that group. What they produced, I believe, came in after.

Commissioner Mitchell: I was watching too on how things went with time and yes, there were people that used that comment period afterwards but the bulk of everything had been done beforehand. Large bulk.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Please continue.

Ms. Ruether: So the next steps: We tentatively have deliberations scheduled for December 12<sup>th</sup>. If the Commission would like more information before then that can be changed. It's kind of up to you guys, but that was what was tentatively put on the calendar. Do you have any questions or need any follow-up information from me before we enter deliberations?

Chair Raschko: Are there any questions – or, more specifically, is there any more request for more information?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: We have what we need?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Ms. Ruether: That's it for me.

Chair Raschko: No other questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, thank you very much and I'd just like to comment: That must have been a lot of work assembling all of that. Thank you for your effort.

Ms. Ruether: Yes. And thank you to my intern because that's why I still have hair. He compiles all of those attachments and the attachments. So thank you to Brett for that.

Commissioner Mitchell: You guys did a beautiful job. Jack, they did wonderfully.

Jack Moore: They did. It's been great.

Chair Raschko: Okay, we'll turn now to the Director's Update. Mr. Moore, please.

Mr. Moore: Certainly. Good evening, Commission. I'd just like just to share a few notable items with the Planning Commission that is happening within the Planning Department, Planning and Development Services. One item is our – for possibly obvious reasons – our fire marshal team has lifted the burn ban. They work in conjunction with the fire departments, other local fire marshals, and the state DNR to determine coordinated times for both generally implementing and lifting burn bans. So that happened just a couple of weeks ago here.

The Lake Erie Gravel Mine special use permit was of great interest to a lot of our community, and there was an appeal hearing and it was remanded back to the hearing examiner for some further consideration. So that will be ongoing. In the near future it'll be rescheduled for additional work from the hearing examiner.

We did receive our first special use permit for a battery energy storage system. So we've had multiple pre-development meetings with some different companies about potential locations, but we did receive a special use permit for a location right up near the County Transfer Station in their

Heavy Industrial zone. Puget Sound Energy owns some property up there and we did receive, like I said, the special use permit for that. That will be ongoing in process and so we'll see how that progresses.

I don't recall if I had mentioned this at our last meeting, but we did get back comments from the Department of Ecology regarding our draft Shorelines Update. So the Department of Ecology – we hosted here a public hearing a few months back for the Department of Ecology to have a public hearing. They collected quite a number of comments. Ecology came back with a several-hundred-page response to all of that. So the Department is now working with our consultant, our Shorelines Plan consultant, to go through Ecology's comments, formulate responses, provide additional information, and we did ask for a bit of extra time for that as Ecology asked us for extra time to compile the comments, as they were voluminous.

Let's see...maybe – oh, the Comprehensive Plan Update grant. We have put in a grant application for some monies for our required update. This is, as you may recall, it's our full cycle update so it's required to be done by mid-2025. So we did put that in. We should be getting – the state is intending to fund all or most of that so we're very thankful for that. We're also looking at a supplemental grant. There are some requirements in this cycle for considering various aspects of climate resiliency, and they've offered even more money if we want to do some deeper studies in that regard. So we're looking at the feasibility of applying for that second grant as well. So that'll be interesting as we move forward in the next couple years in our Comp Plan – full Comp Plan Update.

So I think that is all I have, unless you'd like to add anything, Sarah.

Chair Raschko: Has anybody any questions for staff? Yes?

Commissioner Hutchinson: The battery permit that was awarded for PSE, do we have any ETA – a date on, like, the install timing for that?

Mr. Moore: No. So the permit was not approved. We received an application for their special use permit. So that will go through a public process once it's determined to be complete. We'll be able to review it and run SEPA, go through the public comment process, and then ultimately make a decision on whether it can be there. If it's approved at that point, then they could apply for the actual development permits – so building permits, grading permits, civil site improvement grants, et cetera.

Commissioner Henley: Question?

Mr. Moore: Yes?

Commissioner Henley: What's the battery chemistry being proposed?

Mr. Moore: Lithium-based, I believe.

Commissioner Henley: Okay. That's going to give you another problem, as you're aware.

Mr. Moore: Yes, yes. We've seen quite a few instances in the news where they've had some problems in various locations, both in-state and out-of-state. This is something our fire marshal team is keenly aware of and staying on top of as fire fighting and emergency response for those is *specialized*, we'll say. It's not easy –

Commissioner Henley: Highly specialized.

Mr. Moore: Highly specialized, yeah. Primarily the response – the current response method is to stand back and evacuate and let it burn. Unfortunately. So there's not a great – while the cabinets come with safety measures: explosion doors for release of pressure; they have, you know, air conditioning units to keep things cool to try to be, you know, preventative. But yes, if there is ultimately a fire in one of those cabinets there's very little you could do to extinguish that fire. No average fire department has that capability. They don't come without their concerns.

Chair Raschko: Yes, Joe?

Commissioner Woodmansee: So if there *is* a fire, what do you do with all the debris left over?

Mr. Moore: Hazmat response. Yeah, and that's not something the County would do. That would be a requirement of the company so we would build that right into the special use permit prior to them ever starting any development onsite. We would have to have an agreed-upon hazmat response for both the incident – likely the incident – and also the cleanup.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I don't know anything about these \_\_\_ fires. I mean, where *do* you take something like that? Do you incinerate it?

Mr. Moore: You know, I'm not sure. I would have to look into that for you.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I mean, there wouldn't be anybody that would want them in their backyard anywhere.

Mr. Moore: Uh, no. You know, I can look into that and find out. I'm not sure what those companies would ultimately do with the material that they have to pick up offsite.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I mean, it seems like that would be good information for the permit process.

Mr. Moore: Okay.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Like, to understand, you know, how bad is the contamination and – you know, there's been fires so there's been cleanups.

Mr. Moore: Definitely something we'll be looking at while we're reviewing these applications.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Is the risk worth the reward kind of a thing even?

Mr. Moore: Well, yes!

Commissioner Woodmansee: To our local environment, right?

Mr. Moore: Sure. Sure.

Chair Raschko: Kathy?

Commissioner Mitchell: I've got a question and I don't know if you want me to – it's not related to what you just said but it's to tack on from the last meeting – a request for information for you.

When we were talking about the Guemes well thing for the Comp Plan, there was a meeting, a couple of meetings that they had over, I think it was a three-day weekend. I know one of the other Planning Commission members had sat in and listened to some of that stuff as well. There was a USGS survey – they had employed somebody, a geologist, to do that. And forgive me for reading this. This is the prompt note that I wrote myself to ask you. So from the meeting minutes last year, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2023, excerpt, they had reported that the USGS studied 98 wells on the island and they were still compiling information – the geologist was – and the preliminary report would be available in March and the final report in September. Well, September's come and gone and we've got the issue that's going to be coming up before us in the Comp Plan, which is integratedly related. I mean, it's important to know that information. Have you guys seen that report yet? And if so, can the rest of us see it? Because it does matter.

Mr. Moore: I've not seen it yet. I can check with our natural resources team, our water review team, to see if they've – either have a copy yet or if they have an ETA on that. And yes, I could certainly provide that.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, if you don't mind making sure that's on the – for us to see. That's very helpful. Thank you.

Mr. Moore: Certainly.

Chair Raschko: Anything else for Mr. Moore?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Well, thank you.

Mr. Moore: You're welcome.

Chair Raschko: So we'll have Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements. Jen, would you like to go first?

Commissioner Hutchinson: Job well done on the compilation and your reporting. Thank you, Sarah, for putting that all together – and your intern.

Commissioner Rose: I have nothing. Thank you.

Commissioner Henley: No, I have nothing this time.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Nothing.

Vice Chair Tammy Candler: I don't have anything.

Chair Raschko: Thank you much for your hard work. Okay, Kathy?

Commissioner Mitchell: Ditto. Thank you.

Commissioner Amy Hughes: I have nothing more to add.

Chair Raschko: Okay, well, that concludes our agenda. Thank you, everybody. Everybody have a good evening and we'll be adjourned (gavel).