

Question: What are your thoughts and/or questions about a tiered structure for equestrian facilities?

| # | Responses | # of Agreement Stickers |
|----|--|-------------------------|
| 1 | Equestrian facilities are a huge benefit to the community! The County SHOULD be asking "how can we better support equestrian facilities so that you can serve the community better?" | 7 |
| 2 | We the people have already said get out of our property | 2 |
| 3 | How does the County know and account (have the staff) to enforce said "new" regulations? Based on intensity of land use External Impacts Infrastructure Capacity | |
| 4 | Health and Safety | |
| 5 | Spend money on educating land owners on BMP rather than on money to pay people to regulate. Regulations are in place for WA | |
| 6 | Veggie stands and equestrian are not the same and should not be treated as one. No regulation | |
| 7 | we do not need to be regulated. | 1 |
| 8 | Existing Structures should not change. Some properties that are established & thriving are unable to expand to the minimum 5 acres due to "zoning". What about them? | |
| 9 | This is simply another attempt to hit equestrian facilities with potential permits/regulations. No tiers are required. | 5 |
| 10 | Please do not impose tiers or regulations. | |
| 11 | No tiers. It is unnecessary to "tier" equestrian facilities - what is the purpose other than to regulate/tax or to get a foot in the door to regulate all horse prop? | 3 |
| 12 | It is a waste of tax payer dollars to write codes and regulate something that does not need to be regulated. | |
| 13 | The amount of tax dollars being spent on a non-issue is staggering. Tiered /non-tiered shouldn't even be considered for a non-issue. | 1 |
| 14 | No NEW Regulations! | 5 |
| 15 | De-Regulation! | 5 |
| 16 | A farm or ranch is a place that grows green for animals and humans. Space for action events with noise bad smells, dust and expectations. | |
| 17 | Why single out Equestrian Operations! A <u>lot</u> of rural businesses generate dust, noise smells. | |
| 18 | No regulations for equestrians. You haven't listened to us or any surveys we have already done! | |
| 19 | How will you address the struggle to afford these new regulations? The community will most likely shut down not being able to keep up with costs. | |
| 20 | This is the opposite of supporting us. | |
| 21 | How will this affect just personal use farms? We will not be able to grow or adapt if our facilities are unable/permanent. | 1 |
| 22 | Why do equestrian facilities need to have unnecessary regulation, when the real issue is whether or not the person in question was not complying with "farmstand" regulation. | |
| 23 | "Impact" - on what? An incompatible UGA next to a farm? Would that be "impact" leading to regulation? | |
| 24 | What about educating the urban new comers about the <u>rights</u> of rural farms and businesses? | |
| 25 | If you want to a rural areas you must examine area. This is not an equine issue or farm issue. | |
| 26 | Equestrian facilities must often change to survive, sometimes operating large, sometimes small, putting them in a category might not be helpful. | |
| 27 | If it's not "broke" don't fix it. Deal with a problem 1-1. | |
| 28 | Enforce regs. already in place NO tiers! NO further! | 3 |
| 29 | There shouldn't be any tires. One issue between two people shouldn't impact a whole County and business that have been around for decades. | |
| 30 | I can't believe this has gotten this far! Violates the Constitution! Illegal! Abusing our tax dollars! | 1 |
| 31 | Will this regulate more rural facilities with no neighbors? | |
| 32 | So we cannot have small facilities anymore? How are we supposed to grow and adapt our business if we can't start small? Too many limitations. | |
| 33 | Sales - egg sellers have less environmental impact than say - hay sales. | |
| 34 | Existing regulations <u>more</u> than cover the issues. No further regulation is needed! | |
| 35 | How can you define tiers if there is no definition of what a commercial facility is?? | 1 |

Question: What are your thoughts and/or questions about a tiered structure for equestrian facilities?

| # | Responses | # of Agreement Stickers |
|----|---|-------------------------|
| 36 | When they turn into "venues" - Noise ordinance vs. traffic on HOA roads | |
| 37 | Who determines impact? Subject to interpretation by the inspector. | 2 |
| 38 | NO MORE REGS. JUST ANOTHER ATTEMPT TO REGULATE AND EXTRACT MORE MONEY FROM ALREADY OVER TAXED AND OVER REGULATED PERSONS! | |
| 39 | No further regs. | |
| 40 | FYI - The Snohomish code is why many Equestrian Businesses NO LONGER EXIST | 4 |
| 41 | We don't need more regulations for equestrian facilities. There are already regulations in WA State. | 8 |
| 42 | No further regulation is needed. Enforce the existing regulations without adding more! | 3 |
| 43 | Small facilities should be treated differently | 4 |
| 44 | What about a small facility that only houses self-owned horses but allows groups (4H/FFA/Pony Club) to use their facility? For occasional use? | |
| 45 | We don't need more regulation. Instead look at removing some of our excessive regulation. | 2 |
| 46 | We waited years under current permitting process - eventually gave up... | |
| 47 | The impact of facilities should require some sort of regulation. | |
| 48 | Why are you not here this evening? Leave us alone! Do Nothing! | 1 |
| 49 | We currently have enough regulations and complete all of our improvements without government assistance. Why are you able to destroy our lives? | |
| 50 | Why do we need this? No regulation is necessary. | 2 |

Question: What Factors Should Define Potential Tiers?

| # | Responses | # of Agreement Stickers |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| 1 | Please stop the witch hunt! Don't divide us and pit neighbors against each other | |
| 2 | Some Property cannot be re-zoned. Protect commercial and personal use. | |
| 3 | If you want less traffic stop building apartments around our beautiful farms! | |
| 4 | Existing structures should <u>NOT</u> change. | |
| 5 | Shape of land...unable to tier due to roads, landmarks, structures and trees and/or wetlands. | |
| 6 | Don't make tiers. | |
| 7 | No tiers necessary. | |
| 8 | Tiers in a horse facility is very stupid and against our rights! | |

Question: What Existing BMP education materials are you aware of or familiar with?

| # | Responses | # of Agreement Stickers |
|----|--|-------------------------|
| 1 | National Resources Conservation Service | 1 |
| 2 | BMPs Clearly defined in the FARM PLAN w/ should also require following BMP portion of Right to Farm | |
| 3 | Minimum distances from wells/public water supply/water sources Manure Management Pasture Management Setbacks for structures/fencing THESE REGULATIONS ARE ALREADY IN EXISTANCE - WHY CREATE MORE?? | |
| 4 | Any knowledge this currently has for mud management is greatly smiled on. | |
| 5 | Cooperative Extension | |
| 6 | Pierce County has a pasture management class to help prevent erosion and help grass/weed management. Manure management Mud management | |
| 7 | Pasture Management | |
| 8 | Kitsap Conservation provides extensive BMP tech assistance plus cost share funding. | 1 |
| 9 | What cost share?? | |
| 10 | Weed, manure, pasture, animal fences, mud, dust. | 1 |
| 11 | Manure, dust, water, fencing | |
| 12 | Kitsap CD also has lists of BMPs. | |
| 13 | KCD is an excellent resource for BMP | 3 |
| 14 | Kitsap Conservation District is an incredible resource when voluntarily accessed. These zoning changes will prevent people from accessing support for fear of negative consequences. | |
| 15 | Already have KCD, <u>nothing</u> else is needed. | 2 |

Question: What Best Management Practice (BMP) challenges are most common?

| # | Responses | # of Agreement Stickers |
|----|--|-------------------------|
| 1 | Dealing with the county control. | |
| 2 | Funding - educate & then access to grants or loan programs for ag. | 1 |
| 3 | Horse/farm owners, for the most part, are the biggest proponents of best practices - why must it be regulated? There are already regulatory structures in place for those who truly need it, i.e. animal abuse or nuisance property. | 1 |
| 4 | KCD is under funded and understaffed. Even if we are open to education /BMP will that be properly funded? | 1 |
| 5 | Challenges include cost and lack of information. Both of which can be facilitated by Kitsap CD | |
| 6 | The government needs a designated spot to filter our input. | |
| 7 | Lack of resources - finding spots to dispose of manure | |
| 8 | Lack of funding which causes too long of delays for support. Cannot wait 12+ months for answers. | 2 |
| 9 | Fear of regulation cost. | |
| 10 | Requirements to follow BMPs. | |
| 11 | Over Regulation. | 3 |
| 12 | Support. | |
| 13 | The government needs a designated spot to filter our input. | |
| 14 | The best management practice is less gov. control. | 2 |
| 15 | Funding Direction is subject to interpretation (not consistent). | |
| 16 | Farms are noisy and dirty - move to the city if it bothers you - we try to be conscientious neighbors, but BMP enforced by the gov is a dangerous slope (and cost prohibitive). | |
| 17 | BMP does not understand or take into account the differing parcels in Kitsap. | 2 |
| 18 | Fear of regulation & government over reach forces facilities to avoid seeking advice. | 3 |

Question: What benefit would encourage participation in a farm registration program?

| # | Responses | # of Agreement Stickers |
|----|---|-------------------------|
| 1 | Why and what is the reason for permits? | |
| | We have already told you what we want. You don't like the answer so just keep inventing new ways to "get our opinion". The answers don't change. We've already told you. We the people want | |
| 2 | you <u>out</u> of our property. | 3 |
| 3 | Educating land owners | 1 |
| 4 | Protection of existing use. | |
| 5 | There is no benefit in participating in tyranny!! | |
| 6 | Communication! Asking the people what <u>they</u> need not telling them what they need to do! | 1 |
| 7 | Opportunity to have a group and have an opinion. | 1 |
| 8 | There is no benefit with this. | 1 |
| 9 | Incentive like reduced permit fee. | |
| 10 | Without knowing what the program is, it is difficult to propose benefits. | |
| 11 | Break down barriers. Money, time, education. | |
| 12 | Proper advertising to general public not just posting on your website. | 1 |
| 13 | Neighbor notification. | 1 |
| 14 | NO REGISTRATION. A dangerous precedent. | |

Question: How could registration reduce conflicts or improve communication?

| # | Responses | # of Agreement Stickers |
|----|---|-------------------------|
| 1 | 1. Could a farm plan through KCD qualify as documentation? 2. Documentation in vested current code & qualifying for permit & be protected. 3. Kitsap Conservation District. | |
| 2 | Establish point of contact, open lines of communication. | |
| 3 | Do not hold us "nonconforming" to future change! | 1 |
| 4 | Residents should have a say especially if impacted by ingress/egress safety. | 1 |
| 5 | Awareness, support, & boundary importance. | |
| 6 | Create reports w/pertinent info so that the County can make EDUCATED decisions. | |
| 7 | Residents would know of commercial business in their neighborhood. | 1 |
| 8 | Document approved use. | 2 |
| 9 | It will not | 1 |
| 10 | We pay taxes, you know where we live...you have Google Earth...please stop! | 1 |

Question: What should qualify as a farm stand with code edit or addition?

| # | Responses | # of Agreement Stickers |
|----|--|-------------------------|
| 1 | The current code is fine. We do not need to make any changes. | |
| 2 | Clarify existing code to allow for clarity of standards. | |
| 3 | It is unclear <u>why</u> farm stand questions are raised at the comm. equestrian facilities workshop??? Related?? | |
| 4 | As far as the County goes <u>nothing!</u> | |
| 5 | What is wrong with the current code? | |
| 6 | Farm grown products intended for sale. Business License and permits! Grown on property (local) | |
| 7 | Not imported from East WA. | |
| 8 | We don't need another code. The current code handles it as written. | 2 |
| 9 | Existing code 14.455.060 gives a good definition. Don't change. | |
| 10 | Local produce. | |
| 11 | A child (16 years or younger) selling farm or home grown - don't need a license - a child will not be selling w/o parents. No imports or commercial. | |
| 12 | Current code covers this well. | |
| 13 | Produce produced on farm or as allowed by current code. | |
| 14 | Should be defined in intended use. Current code lacks clarity and allows for multiple interpretations. | |
| 15 | What about nurseries? Are nursery stands included? | |
| 16 | Anything a farm or ranch wants to sell should be allowed and anyone should be able to make a farm stand! | |

Question: How do we verify if it qualifies as a farm stand?

| # | Responses | # of Agreement Stickers |
|----|---|-------------------------|
| 1 | Farmstands have nothing to do with equestrian facilities. why is this even being brought up? | |
| 2 | How would a farm store be affected? | |
| 3 | Consider moderate home business. | |
| 4 | If 50% is grown on property. | |
| 5 | Business plan licensing, Permitting size - eggs vs. hay. Beef vs. veggies. License to sell & process. Inspect. | |
| 6 | Equestrian facilities, in my experience, don't produce anything that would be sold in a farm stand, therefore I'm not sure we should have much weight in their regulation. | 3 |
| 7 | Farm stand plan w/ traffic planning. | |
| 8 | If enough of the product is produced on site /in County vs. if it is not, it should not qualify. | 3 |
| 9 | The code as written is vague and ready to be abused. nothing is measurable or well defined. Define what you want and how to verify it. | |
| 10 | Use the current code 17.455.060. It seems quite clear. | |
| 11 | All stakeholders need to be involved . Farmers: protein, food, hay, etc. | 2 |
| 12 | Why do we need to "verify that it "qualifies as a farm stand" at all? Not all goods are grown i.e. welded horseshoe art etc. | |
| 13 | Why are we talking about farm stands? Leave them alone! | 2 |
| 14 | Farm stands are a separate entity from equestrian facilities. Therefore they should have differing regulations. They should have NO effects on any equestrian facility discussions. | |

| # | Written Comments Dropped in Comment Box at Open House 02/25/2026 |
|----|---|
| | 1) NO NEW CODES ARE NEEDED. 2) EXISTING CODE SHOULD ADDRESS ALL ISSUES. |
| 1 | 3) INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED AS SUCH & NOT AFFECT EXISTING CODES. |
| 2 | No new codes are needed - Get educated people to research the effects. |
| 3 | I think we should start with enforcing current regulations before pulling new laws and funds from other needed areas. The majority of farms are not an issue. And all current rules fix the current problems. Thank you! |
| 4 | The fact that we are still having to deal six months on is disgraceful. Nothing new is needed. End it already. |
| 5 | The amount of our tax payers money that is being spent on what is a neighbor conflict is staggering. Given the actual # of registered complaints over the ten year presented period this should be a non-issue as far as the County is concerned. We do not need new regulations or codes. |
| 6 | We do not need further regulation. Enforce the regulations that are already in place. |
| 7 | All of these proposed regulations are dumb and are a violation of our God given rights to do what we please on our own land. Thank you. |
| 8 | If proposed code changes don't effect current facilities and only future ones then all of this is a waste of tax payers time! Each problem or complaint needs to be handled one on one. The entire equine community doesn't need to be effected because of this one facility's faults. |
| 9 | No further regs needed. |
| 10 | Code enforcement could mitigate many of the specific complaints filed. Why are we discussing such blanket solutions for a few specific problems/locations? |
| 11 | This was a problem between two people on the same road. Why is this everyone's problem now? Not on neighbor's complaints alone Not on presence of revenue |
| 12 | Not on perception of business activity |
| 13 | Concerned that these proposed code changes are not necessary due to a couple of complaints. What is in store of Kitsap County? Urban.... No code changes! |
| 14 | There is NO NEED for a tier structure when we already have State laws. All of the complaints that have come in regarding a horse facility could easily be addressed with <u>existing code</u> . |
| 15 | The response of creating a new list of regulations is unnecessary, and won't actually fix any of the issues of complaint! Also, existing equestrian facilities are grandfathered in so none of the new code will address the existing complaints at all! It will only act to effectively end any new development of equestrian facilities. E facilities are a huge draw for people to Kitsap County. It would be criminal to jeopardize these activities by instituting code that has no scientific basis, no proof of effectiveness. People with no knowledge of equestrian practices should <u>not</u> create code regulating those practices. That is just common sense. |
| 16 | People shouldn't be trying to write codes for horse facilities who don't know anything about how they function - Can't you just deal with the one barn in obvious violation of existing codes? The existing code is just <u>fine</u> . |
| 17 | Disappointing that there was no sign-in - There was a lot of participation from the equestrian community to engage. |
| 18 | The content was very misleading based on the advertising of the meeting tonight. The 3/4 topic points were ag related leaving out any local businesses or farmers. There is no clear lines or definitions in pertains to |
| 19 | No change in regulation should be implemented. Garrett Ballew told me that regulations would only affect existing facilities; this in itself is an issue. Over regulation will stagnate growth while facilities close. Nothing will have the opportunity to come back in and replace and regrow. Effectively ending equestrian lifestyle in the County. |
| 20 | How will you address the struggle to afford these new regulations and expectations? The community will most likely shut down not being able to keep up with costs. Decreasing revenue and interest within the community and entire County. another hobby lost. Entrepreneurs will no longer have a chance. |
| 21 | Would like to understand what lack of Federal funding should any of this motion to pass? |
| 22 | The Year of the Rural is supposed to <u>PROTECT</u> the future of regular people trying to enjoy the rural lifestyle here. this will <u>NOT</u> protect - Regulating us out. |
| 23 | Nothing in Year of the Rural protects small businesses or ag related activities. |

| # | Written Comments Dropped in Comment Box at Open House 02/25/2026 |
|----|---|
| 24 | The whole idea behind Year of the Rural is to protect & preserve the rural aspects of our County. The new proposed code regarding equestrian facilities will not change anything that currently exists, but it will absolutely prohibit any <u>new</u> equestrian endeavors. What if a couple has some acreage that could help local WAHSET or 4H kids that need the space? Absolutely a wonderful use of rural Kitsap. But the new code would make it nearly impossible for such a use to newly occur. Regular people are the ones who will be hurt. |
| 25 | THE YEAR OF THE RURAL IS SUPPOSED TO PROTECT THE FUTURE <u>NOT</u> JEOPARDIZE IT. REGULAR PEOPLE NEED TO BE ABLE TO ENJOY OUR RURAL LIFESTYLE. |
| 26 | No new code needed. Current code covers. Where is the evidence new code for horses <u>specifically</u> is needed. No complaint data has been made available. |
| 27 | Unfortunately with this push to regulate and add/change codes the people that will suffer are average middle and lower class families that are in Kitsap County. Having all these regulations makes it expensive to help out a local kid with their FFA livestock project, or a neighbor kid who could board their horse at a small neighbors property so they can afford to enjoy the WAHSET team. When my kids grow up I would love to offer to board local kids horses to make it cheaper for them but if I have to pay for added regulations and codes that makes no sense. My kids found FFA and raising livestock, who knew this would happen, would they need a permit to build a barn for their lambs? That is ridiculous! They get penalized for being hardworking kids instead of being on their phones. The big corporations will pay all your fees, and the regular everyday people will have huge impacts. |
| 28 | State law covers everything proposed in the tiered structure. Kitsap should not override State codes and laws. |
| 29 | We have the code we need already in place, it's just not being enforced. |
| 30 | If only a couple facilities are being complained about. why has it gone this far? Enforce the code we already have. |
| 31 | Government should be <u>FOR</u> the people...They are in the <u>service</u> business. Your <u>1st</u> question should always be to the people in your community "What can we do for you? What do <u>you need</u> to make our community thrive?!" |
| 32 | 1) Farm stands & equestrian facilities have nothing in common. For code purposes they should be kept separate. 2) Existing codes are sufficient! Clarify and then enforce existing codes on all levels (Federal, State, County). No Wasteful new expenditures on Code Changes! |
| 33 | Mandating fences not being placed on property lines Opens up for adverse possession from neighbors or Additional cost to build a 2nd fence on the property line Reduces useable land & raises cost. |