JN-Jon Neal, BOCC, District 3

AH—Andy Hover, BOCC, Vice-Chair, District 1

CB—Chris Branch, BOCC, Chair, District 2, via Zoom

LJ—Lanie Johns, Clerk of the Board

NP—Naomie Peasley, Fairgrounds Manager

MG—Maurice Goodall, Emergency Management

PP—Pete Palmer, Planning Director

SK—Shelley Keitzman, Risk Management and Human Resources

Commenters—

Isabelle Spohn

**Chad Standsbury** 

Scott Vejraska

Katlenia Vejraska

Darren Wise

Rod Haeberle and his daughter

Darryl Green

These notes were taken by an Okanogan County Watch volunteer. Every attempt is made to be accurate. Notes are verbatim when possible, and otherwise summarized or paraphrased. Note takers comments or clarifications are in italics. These notes are published at <a href="https://www.countywatch.org/">https://www.countywatch.org/</a> and are not the official county record of the meeting. For officially approved minutes, which are normally published at a later time, see

https://okanogancounty.org/offices/commissioners/commissioners proceedings.php

The time stamps refer to the times on the AV Capture archive of the meeting on this date at <a href="https://www.okanogancounty.org/departments/boards/live\_streaming\_of\_meetings.php">https://www.okanogancounty.org/departments/boards/live\_streaming\_of\_meetings.php</a>. To locate items in real time, the clock on the wall in the AV Capture screen can be helpful.

#### **Summary of significant discussions:**

- Seven commenters tell the BOCC they are extremely unhappy with the Tunk Valley re-zone decision
  which establishes 160 acre lots. They feel they weren't properly notified about the Planning
  Commission meeting that recommended the change. They said there should have been notification
  posted on the road entering the area, and sent letters and phone calls notifying nearby property
  owners in addition to the legal notice in the newspaper. They also feel the change from 5 acre lots
  to minimum 160 acre lots robs them of the value of their land.
- Naomie Peasley, Fairgrounds Manager tells the BOCC that the recent improvements at the Annex have turned the venue into a professional meeting area. She also describes the planned upgrades to the electrical connections at the arena.
- Pete Palmer, Director of Planning assures the BOCC that the Planning Department met all notice requirements under the law for changes that will affect many property owners instead of just a few.
- BOCC discusses budgets for the Oroville EMS District, Tonasket EMS District and the Methow Valley EMS District.
- Shelley Keitzman updates the BOCC about the possibility of hiring security guards for the Court House. BOCC tells her to move forward in hiring two unarmed guards from Pacific Security at a total of \$104,000 per year.

**03:00**—Discussion of Agenda.

CB—How's the agenda?

AH—Looks fair. There are people here for public comments. I think we want to move the staff meeting back to 10:00. Eight people in the room and two on-line.

CB—I'll pass the management to AH during the comment period because he's in the room.

AH—I think I know what this is about. I think along with comments, we should have public engagement, too.

CB—I have to leave to go to Seattle for a doctor's appointment this afternoon, so I'll have to leave at 10:00, but it's OK with me. Engagement means dialogue with them?

AH—Yes. I'd like to answer their questions.

CB—It's about the fair?

AH—No. Tunk.

CB—OK. Well... The Tunk decision is over, but if you think dialogue is necessary.

AH—I think it'd be good to answer questions about it.

CB—I was thinking about a news release as well, but that won't happen right away.

AH—We'll see who comes in for the staff meeting and play it by ear.

CB—I'll just stay here until 10:00 and check in while I'm in the car if I can.

#### **07:40**—AH—Isabelle, do you have a comment.

IS—First I'd like to get clarification about the agenda. Under "other meetings" it says that Rick Bailey and the Forest Services Projects discussion at 2:00 PM. Is that happening or not? Is it on Zoom?

LJ—I think you were going to meet with you (AH).

AH—He wants to with the BOCC.

IS—That's who he thinks he's meeting with.

AH—I told him to call you and get set up on a meeting. (To IS)—We'll figure it out.

IS—Great. My next comment is about Tunk. There was a meeting mentioned for today on the Agenda last week that isn't going to happen, so maybe it caused confusion. But it's not on the agenda today, and there are a lot of people to make comments, so I'll just say thanks.

#### AH-next commenter:

CS—I'm Chad Standsbury and I live in the Tunk Valley. Thanks for your time. I want to discuss an action that's already set in stone, already been made, and that's the Tunk re-zone. Disputes over water adequacy and water rights in Tunk and Tamarack Springs Basin aren't new. Our property and my wife's family has been engaged in water disputes since a court case in 1913. The re-zone isn't an answer, only an action without any positive effect and taking of property without just compensation.

CS—Another question that was misrepresented in the SEPA document for the change to R-160—was the Soriano acreage that's already in conservation easements and others included in the studies and acreage accounts? The answer is Yes, but not at all correct. 47 of the large parcels with conservation easements as stated by the Planning Director at the Nov. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Sorianos own 3700 acres in conservation easements and a grazing association owns another 5500. So over 9200 acres. Yet no mention of other parcels with conservation easements. There's an additional 68 parcels with a total of 1385 that adjoin us, to add to the 47 the Planner identified.

CS—SEPA process. The proposed dates were incorrect, that alludes to lack of transparency and trust. Also, there was no notification of adjacent land owners sent directly. Legal notifications published Dec. 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>. I realize there were talks about the moratorium for two years, but just to be shut out was unnerving. There were no postings on roads into the valley. No one except those involved knew about the meeting.

CS—So why the rush? Who requested the dates be changed? Was there sufficient time for the commissioners to fully consider the recommendations of the Planning Board? The fact that this was

brought to the BOCC's attention and then ignored brings trust issues up. There are calculations errors in the SEPA draft for R-20 zoning that was in the Nov. 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. There was a discussion with one member of the Planning Commission with a county commissioner. This can be heard in recordings of the meetings. Which numbers are we going to be using? In the meeting it was clear that zoning would address the question of water adequacy and that the moratorium on wells doesn't do anything to help the actual existing land owners. In fact, it will deem over 500 current parcels basically useless.

15:50—AH—Can I address this? We didn't close the basin. Anyone can still build on any lot.

CS—But you closed the water, with the Dept. of Ecology?

AH—No. Absolutely not. Only thing we did was create the R-160 zone. The 740 unbuilt lots in the Tunk, their owners can all build houses up there.

CS-OK.

AH—The only thing we signed was to establish the R-160 zone and changed the district use chart to allow for mining and some other stuff on those parcels.

CS—About notification. Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) get more exposure than this especially with a small focal area rather than a large diverse one. The public notification is my biggest thing. You can listen to the Nov 28<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting and it came down to the moratorium running out. We've been talking about this for years. Other avenues to be explored. I'm looking at it from the perspective on my one son. We can look at the Twin Creeks development. The majority of the 740 lots are there. And conservation easements lots being miscalculated. And now going to R-160 we get the math correct.

CS—It's like being forced into a conservation easement with no compensation. Thanks for your time.

JN—Can we get copies of those? (His documents?).

CS—Yes. Not today, but I'll send you copies.

#### **20:15**—AH—Who's next?

SV—Scott Vejraska. Our family owns one of the big allotments in the Tunk and has for many generations. Without the compensation it's like forcing us into a conservation easement. Someday, if we don't want to ranch, then what? Mr. Neal came in and had to take in a ton of information quickly. Like drinking from a fire hose. We were in WRIA 49. You're saying there's not enough water but I think there is. But what do we do going forward. We're not going to be compensated. Also upset about notification. We heard rumblings going on, but you'd think someone in the county would have made a phone call and said "this is what we're thinking about doing". It'd be a common courtesy thing. If you want to sneak something through, the notification doesn't happen. I think it's detrimental to the ranching community and people who own large tracts up there, that you need a collateral to put down for a loan, you devalued that and it makes it tougher to get a loan. There's not a rancher who doesn't survive on loans. I think we need to go back and do it differently.

SV—Tamarack Springs is on our land. It's the headwaters. That's what bothers me. That's it.

23:35—I'm Katlenia Vejraska. Obviously related to Scott. I have a day job, and I've talked to multiple people and they had no clue. It's been going on for a couple of years and lots of stuff happening for a long time. There's no action spot. Not getting any sort of notice that you're going to devalue our property to such an extreme extent. And you did bring in the fact that Tamarack Springs is being questioned. We had no clue that was going to be a factor in this big decision. It's a huge problem. I see people deal with real estate every day and they get the shaft. That's what we're getting. If we wanted to put something in a conservation easement, whether right or wrong, how's that going to work? We don't have any value anymore. It's now gone. And you did it all without notifying the landowners. I'm not OK with that. That's it.

**25:20**—I'm Darren Wise. I agree with everybody else. The frustration in my mind lies in notification. And the jump from R-20 to R-160 is relatively unprecedented in Washington. My biggest question is why would you do the jump in such a short period of time and why you wouldn't notify private land owners affected by this? Why no notification for public comment? I had to hunt it down, but I received notification from Chad. The process this has taken in such a short period of time, maybe it's a harsh word, but it's is deceitful. I don't appreciate it.

AH—I'll be frank. We've had a moratorium for a year and a half. We got firsthand accounts about people worried about the physical amount of water in their well. Scott talked about WRIA 49. We're not talking about paper water. We'd have mitigated for the paper water in WRIA 49. But people said they had problems with physical water. Commissioners DeTro, Branch and I, we discussed this. We needed to slow this down and stop subdivision until we can figure out what to do. There was a discussion of 20 acres. Should it be 80 acres? 100? 160? But there was no proposal for 20 acres from us. We were the ones that asked the Planning Commission to look at this because of the 700-and-some-odd parcels up there because all those people have a right to put up a house and drill a well. So that's 700+ wells. A lot of water coming out of that bowl up at the top.

DW—Just out of curiosity, why not address the current private exempt well usage of 5,000 gallons/day? Why not reduce it to a lesser amount?

AH—That's not legal for us to do.

DW—They did it on the west side in a number of places.

AH—When they went through rule revision, that's where you can do that. Also, do you want to have your 5,000 gallons/day reduced?

DW—The average family of four, including 1 acre of yard or garden, uses an average of 400 gallons/day. That's based on a wetter climate than we have. Let's double it to 800 gallons/day. If I'm allotted 5,000 gallons/day, my family only uses 800 gallons in the summer. I'm just looking at alternative solutions that could have happened. I think going to 160 is drastic. Going for a smaller number and looking at it in three years later would be more appropriate. Going to 160 damages a lot of people and the valuation of their land is unfair to be done without notification to landowners. Is that on you? The Planning Department? Frankly, it's on both of you. Nobody took the time or consciousness to go and say--we're talking about this. Yeah, it's been in discussion for a few years, but it was already decided. As far as I know, this is the first public comment that's taken place. Correct?

AH—No.

DW—But SEPA was just done on Sept.20<sup>th</sup>, correct?

AH—The Planning Commission had a public hearing on this.

DW—But I was never notified and I'm a land owner who's affected by this.

AH—The notification was in the newspaper of legal record.

DW—That's fine, but if I have a neighbor who wants to subdivide, I get notified. I don't think this was done in a proper manner. I feel the last few months were rushed through. And the people affected by this weren't given proper notification nor proper justification or explanation. That's all.

AH—I appreciate your comments.

**32:00**—I'm Rod Haeberle. I'm a long time family landowner in Okanogan County. My grandfather started our ranch in 1923 after fleeing Germany. I just got wind of this just four or five days ago. I don't think I should have received any special notification of this because I don't live in the Tunk Valley. I sure have a lot of friends that do. Everyone in the cattle business is swinging on a limb, about to crash if things don't change. Now my real point of my reason to testify is to say what my grandfather predicted in 1967. He told my brother and me—you kids are pretty young, but always keep your eye on federal,

state and local government. They can steal more from you with the stroke of a pen than you can make in a lifetime. I feel like I just watched this happen. I have no idea where our government feels it can just up and put any stipulation on even 2 acres, which I watched go to 5 acres, which went to 20 acres. And now it's going to go to 160? I'm terrified because if it happened in the Tunk Valley without people being notified well ahead of time, is it going to come to my valley? Will it come to all of Okanogan County? In my opinion, it's out-and-out thievery without compensation. I'm probably wrong, but I think it flies in the face of the Constitution. Our country was founded on the right to own private property and your rights end where your neighbor's nose begins. I also feel that after years and years of hearing these water issues, the Department of Ecology has totally failed our state. If I have the money to drill a well on my land, I feel I should be able to drill the well. If I do, and somebody earlier in time had drilled a well beyond me and gets affected with their water, my water shuts down. That's the chance I have to take. I don't see anything close to that what Ecology does today. My whole point (and I respect you guys. I do.) is where is this going to end? It's never ended in my lifetime with government taking more and more with the stroke of a pen without due consideration, due diligence, due notification and frankly against the Constitution of the US and probably against the state constitution. So thank-you, guys. I respect you. AH—If somebody drills a well up valley from you, and you've got water rights from 1894, and they prove that they just drilled a well and that affected you, then that person is out thousands of dollars for drilling the well. People want to be allowed to do what they want to do on their own property. But if government allows them to do something that costs them money, they blame the government for allowing them to do that. We've seen that. This county...

Rob—That's their misperception. That's been multiplied by the rules and regulations by the Department of Ecology and by our own legislature. If it's been "first in time, first in right" period, that's it. So if I drill a well in 1913 and irrigate my land, and if Seattle moves in above me and drills 500 wells above me, and my well dries up, then Seattle—shut down your wells. That's the risk you took when you came here. How much money do we spend beating around the bush? Having their property rights stolen, like Scott said? That's my fear. Don't know if I'll see my cattle ranch keep going. My kids are gung-ho about it. I want them to make it. And we've gone from 2 acres to 160 and I worry it's going to keep sweeping. Our whole ranch was put into one large parcel, and now I'm told I can't go below 160 acres? That will bankrupt me. Also, I'm scared to death about conservation easements. They've been popular, a brain child of saving agriculture. I see it as destruction of agriculture. Nothing more than an attempt to hang on today because you're bankrupt today. You get a conservation easement and look at what's going to happen in time. If you default, who owns the property them? Usually government. Once you sell your land to a conservation easement and you go broke again, what have you got to sell? You've got title to the land and the privilege of paying taxes on it for the rest of its existence, but if you get up against the wall financially, who'll pay you market value for land you can't do anything with? I think they're dangerous. Really dangerous. I'm done preaching, boys.

**41:10**—I'm Darryl Green and I live in the Tunk Valley and I have since 1980, and my family goes back to the early 1900s in that valley. We're six generations deep. I fully agree with everything Rod and these guys are saying. I think it's a bunch of crap what you guys are doing. Going to R-160? How can that be? How can you take away people's way of life? When's it going to stop? You just keep reaching out and taking away our way of life more and more. I'm not an educated guy, but I've worked my ass off all my life. This is what we base our life on. What will happen if I want to hand mine down to my kids? They don't have a hope and a prayer. Conservation Northwest approached me about a conservation easement on my property. I told them I'd do it the old fashioned way. I'm going to pay for it myself and own it. I won't have people walking into my place and telling them what I can and can't do. It looks like

now there'll be a conservation easement but without any compensation, just like Chad and Rod said. Shame on you. That's the way I feel about it.

43:10—Hi, Commissioner Branch. Hi, Commissioner Hover. Nice to meet you Commissioner Neal. I'm Rod Haeberle's daughter. We don't own property in the Tunk Basin, but we're here to support our neighbors. Also here to advocate on big picture ideology and the way you see land planning in the county. Background—I was a public school teacher for 10+ years, previous Farm Bureau president and worked for the Congressman as an agricultural caseworker. I mainly helped people who'd already applied for a conservation easement to get the easement through. Pretty good background working with conservation easement. Don't want one myself. We're big parcels and we're R-5. If you're going to change my R-5, I don't just want a certified letter in the mail. I want you to call me. That's my level of expectation. We're old families. What you've done is let newbies, and I consider the Sorianos as newbies, come in and dictate to the old guard. The Sorianos got paid. They got a conservation easement. These guys didn't. Maybe they wanted it. Maybe they needed it. I know because I did the case work. R-5 could be worth \$10,000/acre. R-160 is worth \$650/acre. That's a big difference. You've stolen their property value. Hugely. Whether to be developed or sell a conservation easement. If they want a conservation easement now, you've literally stole the payout to them. So I see it as theft. I agree with my father that if you're doing it in Tunk, I could be next. That's very concerning. I want to end by talking about lack of proper notification. I wasn't kidding. I think they should have received certified letters in the mail and if you're rezoning, I want a phone call. I don't know how you lie down at night without the inclusion of the old families that have been up there for so long. And I also think it's relevant that it was done at the end of Jim DeTro's term. I don't where he was at in his headspace, whether he was fully engaged in that final stretch. And then to put this on the plate of a new commissioner who didn't have time to fully know the issue and maybe didn't even have time to talk to his new constituents. I am represented by Commissioner Neal and I don't know if these people had his full advocacy.

**45:40**—AH—In the six years I've been here, the Tunk basin is the only place I've heard where there's physically limited water. People think maybe we'll be going to other places, well, I'm not. The Planning Commission asked us to look into ways to get more water into the system. Having to do projects like artificial beaver dams in the creek to try to wet the area. Right now the water in creek is just flowing out. Those are things we're going to look into also. Can't say this will be forever, but it's a way to halt things until we can figure out what we can do to allow more people to live there.

(Note taker was unable to see who was making the following statements. Several people spoke). Speaker—Is this based on the 2006 water study?

AH—There were a couple of studies, but there were also people saying—hey, my well's going down. I drove up there and people pointed out wells going dry or water getting lower.

Speaker—Where were these wells? Down in the (*inaudible*) Lake area? I've never heard of a dry well in the bottom of the Tunk basin. In the donut hole (left by the fire) has a dry well.

Speaker—On our property, we received a letter about a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) up there. They punched five wells up there and our static water dropped 15'. We went from 30 gallons of water to six. The Planning Department said this was pre-Hirst and there was nothing we could do about it. What good is a CUP if nobody's going to back it anyway. Talking about water rights. I'm an effected person directly. That effect goes back to 1913. It's case law. But then someone new comes in, punches five holes, wants to build a bunch of retreat cabins. We voiced concern. We received proper notification by

letter which was misrepresented because the Planning Department said only five, but those five were slated for the east corner. There are actually 14 going in. We were told—tough luck.

Speaker—Your water was reduced by their actions. This plays right into...

Speaker—(Describes another situation concerning water and this CUP.) I talk issue with talk of the new people in town. I don't want to see more houses, but I want the right to build. But the rate this idea came together. Just 60 days from an idea to implementation. That's so fast. It's full of holes.

Speaker—I was on the Voluntary Steward Program (VSP) committee. I would rather see the county incentivize and partner with programs through the NRCS (Natural Resources Conservation Service) the Conservation District and the VSP to try to restore the water table. Incentivize rather than punish. It feels like theft and it is theft. I would discourage you to going that route.

AH—We'll start looking into what we can do to make more water up there. If five holes were punched and your water went down that far, that's an issue. They're hard decisions. I believe in people's right to their property. But other people come to me to say—hey, they just put in a pot farm next to me and it smells terrible. Can you please regulate that? It's the same with this. If you've got 100 acres in R-5, you can make 20 more lots. We know there are issues there where five holes get drilled and somebody's well went down. Where does the liability lie with us to say we're going to allow people to sell more lots. We're just going to look the other way. I'm not discounting any of your comments. This is a difficult job.

**55:30**—CB—I'm going to have to leave now. I suggest we take this dialog farther than the Tunk Valley. Take it valley wide and talk about subdivision and issues beyond water issues. (CB leaves the meeting.) AH—When I grew up and me and my brother could play on the road. There were only seven people living up the road from us. Now there are 250-300 houses above us. I'm worried about my animals getting hit. Also worry about electrical infrastructure and are the roads good enough. About water—I'm more than happy to incentivize. In Chelan County, they're going artificial beaver dams to keep the water table up. Rob?

Rob—I've heard in the last few days that I've been aware of this. (*Very difficult to hear.*) It sounds to me like this is done.

AH—The zoning is in place now, but if there's enough water, we can do things. There's a lot of things in the state going on with water and people can mitigate for it.

JN—No, I didn't talk to you individually, but I spent a lot of time in the last three months talking to the Planning Commission. They said R-160 is like a band aid on a bullet wound. Stop gap measure, but end game to get more water in the area and then we could rescind this measure. I did pretty diligent research. I wasn't aware that your well dropped when the other wells went in. That should be looked into.

Speaker—I actually know two families that wanted conservation easements right now. They're being limited in the amount of money by one of two things—zoning designated with a big parcel size, or water (the drilling moratorium). If they can't prove they can subdivide or drill a well, they won't be compensated by an easement.

AH—There's no moratorium on well drilling over there (in Tunk). In Okanogan County there is—over in the Methow. There are closed basins that were closed a long time ago but Ecology just started enforcing. As far as I know, in the Okanogan Valley down as far as Brewster, there aren't any limitations on drilling.

Speaker—I think what she's getting at is that the value of an easement. We negotiated this for a year, but they knew this was in the works. They took the value out of our land before we even came to the plate.

Speaker—That's the concern. We're one of the last families who didn't sell their land to developer and didn't sell a conservation easement. If the tribe comes and buys a big tract around you and you're the last man standing, they're going to steal it. That ain't right.

Speaker—And you're buying (inaudible phrase) tax dollars.

Speaker—I think you should take into consideration how we were going to use the easement money. We were planning to buy more ground so we could compete with bigger ranches. When we want to buy more land, we're in direct competition with Fish & Wildlife, conservation groups and developers. Speaker—It was the only way to get cash for the land.

Speaker—Ranching means money for the county. Every cow represents \$3,500 in tax value to the county. Lots fewer cattle and sheep than there was.

**1:04:35**—AH—Any more public comment? It's 10:10. OK. Thanks for coming in and we'll keep working on it.

AH—Naomie?

NP—Good morning. I'm Naomie Peasley, Fairgrounds Manager. We're having the first event in the Annex since the remodel. The Horticulture Society is setting up right now. The Annex floor looks great, it's easy maintenance. It looks like a professional meeting space.

NP—We're working with the BPA and the PUD to get new lighting in the arena.

AH—Make sure that we redo the transformer and put 240 outlets behind the grandstands, and get conduit to where it came under the track.

NP—Estimated cost for all of that is \$120,000. Can't have RVs and generators plugged in and have the arena lights on at the same time. Not enough electricity.

NP—Received a fee waiver reduction request. From Okanogan Athletic Booster Club. \$2,000 to rent the Agriplex for the weekend, and they're asking for a discount. (Reads their letter.)

AH—Don't know that we can.

NP—In the new fee schedule, we can do discounts for the good of the community.

AH—We need to talk to the Auditor.

JN—Did they give a dollar amount they'd like reduced?

NP—No. I can forward this letter to you and the wording of the new fee schedule. Include the Auditor?

AH-No. Just us. I'm not sure how it works.

NP—Any news about the vehicles?

AH—They're on tomorrow's Consent Agenda.

JN—I've got a question. Why 3-phase power? What requires that?

NP—Concerts, and some concessions, other stuff.

NP—That's all from me.

1:12:10—MG—I have no reports. Just came to see if you've got any questions?

AH—Nope. No emergencies going on.

MG describes a car accident.

PP—Good morning. I'm Pete Palmer from Planning Department.

PP—Would you like me to chime in at all about the comments? I know CB talked about a press release later. I want to reiterate again that we met all notice requirements under the law for changes that will effect many property owners instead of just a few. We put it in the news of record, and we had a 21 day comment period instead of 14.

AH—One thing we might want about this—we have the notification system with emergency management. If we do a planning action that's not county-wide, MG can send a notification to people in the area affected. Wouldn't cost us anything.

PP—Talked about that with MG when the notification system began. He wanted it just for emergencies, but we could rethink it.

AH—This doesn't happen all the time.

PP—We've got lots of things coming on, and I thought people would be watching the paper. We're doing rezones that will affect people county wide.

AH—That will come before the Planning Commission?

PP—Yes.

AH—Can you put something on your web site maybe that blinks to say—Stay tuned for zoning changes and check the dates?

PP-OK

JN—In Omak, we could isolate people by their utilities and notify people in their utility bills.

AH—The only way we can do it is with Emergency Management.

PP—So far we've had 46 out of 77 cannabis grows come in and pay their annual fee. \$23,000.

PP—I was cc'ed on an email from Kit Kolllmeyer about the online system policy.

AH—Where he was talking about the 25' setbacks?

PP—Yes. I'm sure you're watching the emails between me and Michael, and I'm sure we've got that process handled now. We sat down a few weeks ago with all of us—how the process would work without going through a whole zone code change for one definition. What we came up with: New (septic?) systems are a no-brainer. They'll require site analysis or zoning permit before anything is issued. If it's a repair or replacement, the health department will call Rocky in our office and she'll tell them whether it's in or outside of any critical areas. Then we'll go from there. If there are permits required, they won't have to get a permit until after the emergency is taken care of.

PP—We're adding one more page to our site analysis form to accommodate the site requirement the Health Department is asking for. Better to have the information on one page and it will be more legible. PP—I wish CB was here. I have the GIS Department has the new, official zoning map. They'll have a QR code and get the map on their phone. They'll print some inset maps of built-up areas without getting out the magnifying glass to see it on the big map.

PP—That's all.

**1:20:15**—AH asks LJ to print out budgets for the three EMS districts. Then he and JN will discuss them.

JN and AH have a brief discussion about the Brewster School District transportation (*inaudible*). The district is appealing something.

**1:27:15**—BOCC convenes as the Oroville EMS District, the Tonasket EMS District and the Methow Valley EMS District to discuss each district's budget.

**1:48:25**—JN—At some point maybe we should have a discussion about what's going on up there. Can we do that in Executive?

AH—We could.

AH—Did you read those emails. Honestly, I was blindsided. I thought we were trying to help everybody and all of a sudden that stuff got read out loud, and I was like—what the hell?

JN—And I've been buddies with (*inaudible*) since forever. I knew there was some hostility, but I didn't know the extent.

AH—Did you read the email on Sunday from (*inaudible*) and then the reply—Hey, you got this. And she showed where she got it and we got it a long time ago. I've seen it. We probably should do that. We could do it as the performance of a public employee and that would be me.

**1:54:45**—CB rejoins the meeting while on his way to Seattle. He will attend the Executive Session by phone.

AH—Move to go to Executive Session under RCW 42.30.110(1)(i) to discuss litigation or potential litigation. Including Ester Milner, Chief Civil Deputy Prosecutor, and Shelley Keitzman, Risk Management and Human Resources. 15 minutes.

Motion passes, and off they go.

#### **2:07:15**—They're back.

JN—We do have a fee waiver. (Fee waiver discussed earlier during update for the Fairgrounds.)

AH—Move to go into Executive Session under RCW 42.30.110(1)(g) inviting Ester Milner and Shelley Keitzman to discuss performance of a public employee. 10 minutes. Motion passes and off they go.

**2:24:10**—AH—It's 11:30 and we have a public hearing to discuss a budget supplemental appropriation for the Current Expense Reserve Fund. Open to staff. The amount we were over in beginning fund balance we discussed putting it away in the Current Expense Reserve Fund. Amount is \$1,019,037. Pretty Straight forward.

No public comments.

JN—I move to approve Resolution 16-2023. And it passes! Close the public hearing.

AH—We didn't have time to hear from SK before, so we'll hear her update right now.

SK—I reached out to Pacific Security, which has a branch in Wenatchee and got an initial quote: \$35/hr for an armed person and \$27.50/hr for unarmed. Jay Yarborough, who's the Operations Manager, said they can provide the service for us. It may take some time to recruit an armed guard for this area, but they can do unarmed guards sooner than that.

SK—Based on 237 day/year of coverage would be about \$66,000 per year for the armed person. If the BOCC approves, I'd like to get a little more formal quote in time for the Court House Security Meeting next week. This was significantly less than I thought it would be.

AH—They could cover us 5 days/week.

AH—CB, I'd be real interested in getting two unarmed people right away.

CB—Sounds good. Get the unarmed now and move into an armed situation (inaudible).

AH—Unarmed is less than \$66,000.

SK—Yes. \$27.50/hr vs \$35 27.50 x 8=220/day x 237days=\$52,000.

AH—Two unarmed guards will be \$104,000. I think Shelley should go forth on those.

All agree. Discussion of correct bidding process. SK will talk to Ester Milner about the process.

SK-I'm done.

**2:23:40**—As the Methow Valley EMS District, BOCC approves voucher for \$63,499.66, and as BOCC approves payroll voucher for \$2,107,401.83 and Public Health voucher for \$81,581,75.

AH—What's going on next Monday in the afternoon?

□—Tentative discussion about ARPA (American Relief Plan Act) funds for Twisp at 1:30.

AH—I've got a doctor's appointment in Wenatchee at 2:00. I've got to leave at noon. Maybe I can zoom from home or maybe I'll have to go to Wenatchee.

□—OK

AH—Adjourn at 11:44 until 9:00 AM tomorrow.