

Monday, March 22, 2021

7:00 PM - Okanogan County Planning Commission Meeting

Planning Commission Representatives:

Albert Roberts (AR) - District 1, Chair

Verlene Hughes (VH) - District 1

Dave Schulz (DS) - District 2

Gina McCoy (GM) - District 2

Phil Dart (PD) - District 3 (Vice Chair)

Salley Bull (SB) - District 3

George Thornton (GT) - At-large Rep, Oroville

Staff:

Pete Palmer (PP) - Planning Director

Angie Hubbard (AH) - Senior Planner

Morgan Allen (MA) - Secretary

Rocky Robbins - Planner

These notes have been taken by one of several volunteer citizen note takers over AV Capture and published on the website of Okanogan County Watch (countywatch.org) The notes have been taken as close to verbatim as possible but are summarized when necessary. Writer's comments, questions, or explanations are in italics. For officially approved minutes of Board of Commissioner meetings, normally published at a later date, see www.okanogancounty.org.

Time stamps below are for your convenience in viewing the county's AV Capture video of the meeting (listed on website as 3/23/21) at <https://okanogancounty.org/avcapture.html>, which now has greatly improved audio.

Summary of meeting : *See summaries at the beginning of each section: Election of Planning Commission members; Palmer assessment of public comments; Methow Valley More Completely Planned Area (Palmer); Planning Commission comments and questions regarding Comp Plan Draft; Alternatives & Selection of Preferred Alternative.*

Highlights: *Roberts//Dart re-elect themselves after 25 seconds of discussion over objections of 3 PC members, saying the process will be discussed again next year. Palmer recommends elements of Alternative 4 be addressed in Methow Valley Addenda to Comp Plan when Methow Valley Sub Area and Sub Unit Advisory Committees meet, but nothing to that effect is put into writing; Palmer states attorneys all very close to agreement on Comp Plan lawsuit, but county will likely face daily fines if Comp Plan is further delayed. Public comments do not need to be addressed by PC because none of the comments brought up anything that was legally lacking. McCoy objects. Alternative 3 selected as Preferred, with revised wording regarding mostly Rural/*

Resource designations; no accompanying map approved yet; no discussion as to whether the Draft will be sent to BOCC now or later, but Roberts states Draft will be sent as is.

Roberts Calls Meeting to order at 6:59

Agenda changes

Palmer - Want to give PC The opportunity attend another short course, virtual. Wants to make a presentation.

Dart - adds election of officers.

Minutes Approved

Schulz - Moves to approve minutes of March 8 with addition on line 9 - others in attendance. (Not clear what the change is.) Carries.

Palmer: Info on Short Course - Dept of Commerce will offer course on local planning, suggested some of board members might be interested. All 6-0 in evening except May 27, 1-4. Starting March 31, then April 29, May 27, June 21. Open Public Meetings, Public Public Records Act, Comp Plan under GMA, mix of land use laws.

Summary of below notes - Election of Planning Commission officers: Controversy over whether Roberts' Rules have been followed, objections to limitation of ability to make nominations and re-appointing existing officers instead; Objection to 25 seconds of discussion being adequate. 3 dissenting commissioners overruled. Roberts breaks tie, stating that he and Dart will remain chair and vice-chair and that additional discussion on the procedure will be taken up next year.

19:43 - AR - Election of officers next.

19:47 - PD: I make *(or I'd make?)* a motion to leave it the way we (Roberts Chair, Dart Vice Chair) are unless someone wants to take my position. *(AR did not call for a second to a motion.)*

20:04 - SB - I'd like to make a motion that we elect two *(new)* officers just to keep people involved.

20:11 - George T. - I was going to say exactly the same thing. It's a good policy to rotate responsibilities so everyone knows what's going on.

20:31 - SB - Can I make a nomination then?

20:32 - PD *(interrupting)*. One thing I'd like to point out is (that he likes AR to be Chair because the Chair has to drive to Okanogan to sign things, and they are not paid for mileage.

20:56 - SB: I'm the chairman of the board of equalization, and I come down here all the time. I didn't think about charging them for mileage.

PD - They won't pay it.

21:10 - AR - I believe that you made a motion (*Apparently to PD*) and we don't have a second yet.

21: 10- DS seconds the motion.

21:16 - AR - Now we can have a discussion.

21:19 - (SB) Oh, there's a motion on?

21:20 - PD - I just moved to leave it (*slate of 2 officers*) the way it was. (*He said he'd make a motion to leave it as is unless someone was willing to take his place. Unclear to note taker as to whether or not it was actually a motion.*)

AR - The "railroad motion." (*Laughter*)

21: 25 SB "The railroad motion!"

21:30 - GT - There should be an open opportunity rather than one motion motion proposing candidates. Procedurally, this is faulty.

21:41 SB - Let's go ahead and vote it down.

21:42 - Roberts - Ok, so we've had discussion on that now.

21:55 - *Vote taken. Dart, Schultz, Hughes vote yes on keeping existing chairs.*

22:08 - GM - Wait, wait - I'm sorry, but we didn't have a chance for discussion- I was sitting here waiting for my opportunity. I'm not comfortable having it just come up and dispensed with. I haven't given it a moment's thought. We have a big meeting coming up. We're not going to discuss it? Would like to have had a month's notice in advance.

22:48 - SB or VH - It was brought up the meeting last time. It was asked that this be put on the agenda.

23:11 - GT - It's a matter of Roberts' Rules. **I protest because of the procedure that limits the opportunity for nominations. It invalidates the procedure.**

SB - **We (*the rest of the group who didn't vote for it*) have not voted yet.**

GT - It's the issue (*of the process*), not who is nominated. We should follow Roberts' rules.

VH - So we could go through and vote on people, but that motion would have to be rescinded.

AR - Let me think.

VH - And yes, we voted on it.

GM - Without the opportunity to discuss.

AR - Asks for nay's. There are 3 - Thornton, McCoy, and Bull.

AR - It's 3 to 3.

PD- Sorry if I ...I was just trying to make it simple

AR - There is a provision I remember that says you can, without having to go through a nomination process, when motion comes up.... that you can elect the *(existing officers?)* by ...uh....uh...unanimous consent.

George - It's not. So that's irrelevant. *(Repeats for AR.)* It's not unanimous consent, so that's irrelevant.

AR - hmhhh.....

25:29 AR - pausing to think.

25:35 SB - For a tie vote, you need to vote.

25:44 - AR That's true. Pause. So....in consideration of George's perspective, as much as I would like to do some other things, I'm going to vote in favor of retaining the same officers for this year. We'll look into it *(rotating chairmanship?)* in the next round next year.

***(Someone)* - How close are we following Roberts' Rules of order?**

26:38 PD - Perry was our expert on that, and....he's not here. Laughter.

Someone: Pete? (No answer, may be looking it up.)

Someone: Let's see.....

VH - Well, we have a tie, and the chair broke the tie. That's the process.

GM - Is it the process to call the vote before any ...any.....

(Someone, interrupting)There was a motion.

AR - Yes. We were having discussion.

GM- well, I missed it.

Loud laughter

GM - I think the vote was called too quickly, personally. Well, ok.

Roberts - OK.

Pete Palmer - Comp Plan: Palmer's Assessment of Public Comments

Summary: Palmer states that all comments came from Methow Valley: a few individual comments are cited *(some incorrectly)*; Palmer summarizes comments from groups and gov't agencies, referring to a document she has given the Commission. Palmer states that this is a working document, so will not include everything. Cites a building department form that should satisfy Yakamas, apparently until new well-tracking software is implemented. States Yakamas want compliance with Growth Management Act *(Okanogan County plans under the Planning Enabling Act.)*

0:27:46: Comments of groups and others: We have all the comments summarized now . All comments came from the Methow. Majority was that you will see the first almost 3 pages were in support of Alt 4 : water, Lower Methow & MCPA, ridgetop construction, dark skies, local advisory committees, no maps, collaboration with tribes, Fish & Wildlife habitat, directing growth away from risk of wildfire. One person was concerned about development of a plan not knowing what the water situation is. Another commented on - zoning changes on his property from 2014 update. Someone wants to readopt the current plan. Farm bureau said their comments weren't (there? Answered?) on DEIS and Comp Plan. Dick Ewing had legal questions of validity. Someone else said we failed to address the VSP. One family opposes the inability to subdivide.

PP: Summary of Comments from others:

Isabelle (Spohn)- She said maps not available. She couldn't find the maps but they were on the website. (*Clarified in chat: Spohn says those maps were out of date. Angie Hubbard chats that there was never a map made for Alternative 4.*) She referenced back to 1976 addendum capturing most of the comments; most were the same as MVCC comments.

WDFW - Wants policy of no net loss. Wants to encourage county to adopt clearing and grading ordinance. (PP - *this will be our next big step*)

WSDA (?) - Commented on County Transportation Improvement Plan and Expenditures, Land issues in county. (?) Wants us to delete reference to RTPO.

Futurewise - Again submitted 2 comments: on Com Plan & EIS. MVCC supported Futurewise comments, so I bullet- pointed them out for you. Tried to include everything they had said prior to this, but some didn't get in because they were pretty onerous.

This is a working document. We couldn't expect the first draft to include absolutely everything.

Another property owner said: Keeping Ag properties into Ag & didn't support building moratorium..

MVCC - pretty much echoed Future wise. Said we inaccurately addressed the previous comments and potential development and water impact. We will respond to that. We included it in the DEIS. We probably should have talked more about what we are doing now rather than what we did before. (*Something about that we have learned our lesson.*)

Dept of Commerce -For the most part when we talked with Scott, they were very satisfied with this draft. Need to Beef up natural lands and (?)

Yakamas - Want us to improve structure of doc for logical flow. Reduction of seemingly contradictory statements. Confusing statements on policy goals on critical areas. Want to insert language from Marcy, 2013 (???) or 2018(???) They wanted consistency with GMA.

Something else about tracking software. We are having the well tracking software. BOCC is in support of expensive software. All will include building, planning, public safety, etc.

(Lost track of conversation here - something about a 9-month implementation period. Building Dept reports their building permit every month. If they do it the prior month, this should satisfy Yakamas until the program is implemented.)

We have a form called 'Developing your dream.' Planning should be the first stop. We will do a 1,2,3 checklist. We will guide them through first part, then send them to other departments.

PD - His friends built a house, but less than so many feet from floodplain . Had house built and then found out they were out of compliance. They asked how the house could be built and they'd be out of compliance. It wasn't until final inspection until they were told they were too close to floodplain. Would be nice toeverything involve din the property should be right up there in front.

DS - Want to compliment the Planning Director for summarizing so well.

VH - you did a great job.

0:44: 20: Palmer - Methow Valley More Completely Planned Area

Summary: Comp Plan is a working document and we can improve it later. MVMCPA and the Sub Unit A planning areas already exist and can cover the public comments. (*Alternative 4*) can be addressed in those documents as an addendum to Comp Plan later in the re-drawing of the area made and would be the vehicle to include the Lower Methow watershed. The Comp plan draft would address the rest of the county. BOCC would appoint advisory group for MVMCPA. (*However, nothing is put in writing to this effect.*)

Pete - I've been thinking really hard about this: This is a working document, constantly moving and changing. We are at a starting point. From here forward we can build on the plan and improve it each time. One thing about reading through - we have two planning areas in the Methow Valley. I really feel all these comments could be simply addressed in the Methow Valley 's own Comprehensive Plan, which would be an addendum to this. and the BOCC are very much in support of re-establishing the advisory group over there. That would be the process and the document that all these comments would go into that as goals and objectives and visionary statements, also the vehicle that they would use to re-draw their area maps to include that Lower Methow watershed.

0:46:10: The rest of the county: In essence, the Comp plan we have here is really addressing the Lower Okanogan Valley. I hope Phil and the rest of you can get people to comment.

PD - There were several comments that we need to develop another Sub Area. The way I understand, the people go in and ask the commissioners. It's up to people in the Lower Methow to petition. (*Note: petition is required in the current plan, not the new draft being discussed.*)

PP: The BOCC would appoint the members of the advisory Committee. They would meet, just like you meet, and anything that would come out of their meeting would come thru you, and then to the Commissioners.

PP - Once we get to that point, not sure we are going to do it simultaneously (meaning *unclear*). There should be 2 advisory boards (*Not clear if this is referring to Methow or Oroville area.*)

Planning Commission comments and questions regarding Comp Plan Draft

Summary: How is current lawsuit being addressed? McCoy - time is up and I've read all public comments and tallied them. We were told by Phil not to dig into the Comp Plan too much before, since we would "tear it apart" again after public comments. Will we address the public comments or not? Palmer - Attorneys are waiting to see the results of this meeting, and we expect to receive daily fines if the Comp Plan is not approved quickly, per a status session with the courts. Public comments can be addressed (*by the advisory committees?*) in the MVMCPA process, since comments were nearly all from the Methow. (PP) Comp Plan issues have been almost resolved by the attorneys. PP, SB, PD: There was really no point in the public hearings because we won't make adjustments relevant to the comments because the comments weren't bringing up anything that was "legally lacking." McCoy's reading and tallies of the comments were apparently irrelevant. McCoy objects, saying she thought that adjusting the Draft as a result of comments was the purpose of a public hearing, stating the lawsuit is not specific to the Methow, particularly regarding water. Dart states the comments were basically all from one organization.

0:49:08 - Shultz asks that we have a brief summary written on the lawsuit that informs them of the corrections and adjustments we've made in response to the lawsuit.

How are we addressing the current lawsuit and public comments in Comp Plan?

0:49:30 GM -

So here we are at 7:40, and I arrived here ready to go to work on the draft in response to the comments we received because the gist of the comments - I read the whole thing and made my own tally. I think we need to do more work to provide something to the county commissioners that's going to adequately to address the legal issues that were made. About a week and a half ago I sent out an e-mail asking how much are we going to go into this, are we open to revising according to public comments, and I got no response. I did a lot of work to get ready for this and another thing I'd like to point out is that multi-

ple times Phil said while we were doing our work, not to get too bogged down into the details because we are going to have to rip it apart after the public comments and make revisions. So I'm feeling pressed for time, since I think there are promises to the county commissioners about when we are going to get a draft to them. are wanting us to get a draft to them, and I think we have a lot of work to do.

0:51:00 PP- I haven't made any promises to BOCC on a timeline of when you will get recommendations to them. They are hoping that it will be coming to them from this meeting tonight because of the lawsuit. We are already behind the gun. We just went through a status hearing a couple of weeks ago, and the courts aren't very happy that we didn't get it done in December of 2018. 2018, and here it is going into April of 2021. Basically, the courts are kind of just waitin' to see what happens out of this, and I can honestly say that if we keep spinning in circles here, I think basically we are going to be looking at daily fines. Most of comments were from Methow Valley. To satisfy the appeal. That was the big push to keep it movin' forward. We can go back and address these comments and get these working groups established because again a lot of the comments are addressing things up in the from the Methow Valley that should be going back into their own comp plans and that would be the vehicle they would utilize to include that lower watershed. Get some of these questions addressed, since most of them belong in the Methow in the MVMCPA. I'm going to just leave that there.

0:52:40 GM- But none of the delay has been on the part of the Planning Commission. I was absolutely dumbstruck that the comments from March of 2018 from the Yakamas - we got them 2 weeks go. We could have been working with those the whole time we've been working on this plan, but we haven't sent them and and we've been asking for the information about what lawsuit specifically, which we were supposed to specifically address - but we (PC) have gotten nothing.

0:53:12 GM So now we have to address the things we should have addressed 3 years ago, and at the very least, the water issue - is not a Methow issue. It does not look at all as if it's been resolved to the satisfaction of the Yakamas or Futurewise.

0:53:35 - PP - Actually, we are - about to have this this almost resolved between the attorneys. They are working hard getting this permit - checking software implemented, that will be a big part of that. So the Yakama nation comments,....I don't know what happened before I came on-board. I got ahold of those comments, contacted Yakamas as soon as I came onboard I got ahold of those comments, made contact with Yakama nation. . My staff has been diligently working through those comments, Futurewise comments, MVCC comments, . To try to make sure all that stuff was adequately addressed in the plan and we went as far as giving them the opportunity to review the draft before it even went to the public.

0:54:30 - SB - Part of what the Yakamas wanted was to be consulted throughout the whole process. With Perry that didn't really happen. He didn't show up for one of the meetings and...whatever happened during that time. Pete has done a great job talking with the Yakamas and getting their input and that we are just seeing their documents for the first time is because she put it out for us. .

GM - You know, I asked at the very beginning of the process to get the information , before you (PP?) came on, for sure. We were directed by the BOCC to pay special attention to the issues brought up in the lawsuits and we never received any actual Information.

SB - No, it's really dropped badly through the cracks. And basically it was because the water element chapter was torn out before they adopted it, and that was an illegal action and there were a couple of other things that were missing entirely, and we've added them - circulation element (Transportation) and rural lands, I think.

0:56:00 (SB) So we've met those standards - the legal standards, from the state's viewpoint. Commerce seems pretty much satisfied, and they are the ones that do the review for the state over comp Plans. I think we've got a great plan at this point - so much better than what was there and better than 1964 definitely . It's a step forward. We can't move forward and keep working on this. That's not the same thing. We have to give it to the Commissioners and have them either adopt it or reject it. And if they adopt it then we can do amendments to it and do the changes, we'll get the advisory committees appointed

0:56:56 - GM - So there really is no point in us having public hearings then, because we aren't going to make any adjustments based upon the comments we received? I thought that was the purpose of the public hearing.

0:57:07 - SB So it's because they weren't bringing up anything that was legally lacking. From what I could read, we've met the standards and before it didn't t meet legal standards. It had big gaps.

0:57:30 - GM- Man, I've got a lot of information here from Futurewise, and....

SB) - (Interrupts) - it was great information.

0:57:36 - PD - Can I make a couple of observations? The public hearing we had last meeting what I sat through and listened to was the comments of one organization. So I look upon it as one comment. They were all scripted. We heard from one org from the Methow - not from anyone else except 2 or 3 comments. Their concerns are more directed towards what they are doing n the Methow. Do't translate wellto the reset of the county. If we try to make Futurewise happy, we make a lot of other people unhappy. Because they want us to be a GMA county. And if we are a GMA county, there is one board of 10 people that decide any land use in Okanogan county. So if we make Futurewise happy, that's what's going to happen. We lose control.

0:59:06 - GM - All I can say is all along I thought we were going through this process and that after the public comment period we were still going to do work and a week and a half ago I said I don't want to do all this work if it's not going to make any difference. And here we are, nobody answered, I did the work - and it's not going to make any difference. And I really think the subject of water needs to be revisited - and that's not a Methow issue. Anyhow, OK. I yield.

59:53 VH - I just want to make a statement that and be very clear - the comp plan is not a regulator. It does not pull out the rules and regulations on it. That's where people get stuck on it. We have to remember that. That's what a comp plan is. We are not calling out the regulations but we are giving people the guide to do that development. Working for the county, I understand that. Went through very single comment again. I felt very comfortable with the comments sent in, and what alternatives they wanted.

PD A lot of comments were to do zoning and water. That's not for the comp plan. This is a guide of how we want those to look, not how it should be

George, they are having a hard time hearing you when you speak, so I'm going to turn this microphone.

1:02:15 - This is county - wide. It is an opportunity to give the Methow an opportunity to do what they want. We can't put this onto the rest of the county. This gives the method an opportunity to do what they want. They are more organized

1:03:41 - GM - There were a couple of suggestions what we adopt VSP and COA by reference. Seems this should be in there - we should be going through there and doing that.

AR - that would be regulatory and doesn't belong in the Comp Plan.

GM - We did it with the SMP, so why not?

PP - We haven't adopted CAO so that's why it hasn't been referenced in the Comp Plan - it's on the back burner for adoption. I don't have the manpower to take on all this other stuff coming down the pike....that's the reason the CAO has not been referenced. Once it is adopted by county, it will be referenced like Shorelines. And it has already started its 60-day review process with commerce. .and all follow the same process. And then eventually work its way into our Comp Plan as a reference tool, Once adopted, will be referenced like the SMP was.

AH - I wanted to clarify that the CAO should not be adopted by reference. WDFW requested that, but Commerce told them that that's not proper to do that. You can have the goals and objectives in the Comp Plan, but should not adopt it by reference in that document. The SMP is re-

quire by statute to have its goals in the Comprehensive Plan. WDFW and Commerce had a side conversation and let us know that.

AR - Not to dismiss the public comment, but the comments are constant throughout all the hearings, so we have a large perspective on those - the changes in the Comp Plan are reflected in that. Not minutely detailed, but much better than it was. This gives the Methow an opportunity to do that. They are more organized and have more opportunities to present those requests to the county.

PD - When we did the 2014 plan because 500 people showed up at Agriplex (*says Fairground*) 2/3 of them gave testimony (*note taker: 2/3 is inaccurate.*) A lot of people don't even know we are doing this now, but if we were way off base and there was something everyone was upset about, we'd have heard loudly. It (*Agriplex*) exceeded capacity in the first 15 minutes. The fact that we have so few comments, and all of them came from one area means either they don't know about it, or they are not upset about it. I think it's close enough that the BOCC can tweak it sufficiently. If we'd had it like 2014..... Even the people in the Methow just want more regulation, but that doesn't really belong (*in Comp Plan?*)

Is there stuff that should be different? Yes. Is there some things that need to be tweaked? Yes. But it's a little minor. But it guides us where we wanted to go. If we leave it the way it is, the BOCC can fix it a little bit and we can live with the guidances here and come up with good zoning and good CAO, and the water will be beat to death. Water is all over the plan.

More Completely Planned Areas - Advisory Committees Discussed

Summary: Thornton asks: Why eliminate long-time residents as members of Advisory Committees in favor of landowners who may not even live here? After lengthy discussion, Roberts promises make a note to Commissioners to review the language regarding Advisory Committee membership. No change made in Draft. Roberts states, and several agree, that language in the Draft forbidding a change in boundaries of an MCPA addressed by McCoy would not apply in the case of the MVMCPA. Thornton advises that more clarity would be a very good idea. No change made, however.

Advisory Committee members discussed

1:11 - GT - See P. 45, Comp Plan - Planned Areas - Significant portion of people in the county are full-time residents and are not land owners. They've lived here for decades. And in the north end, we have significant absentee owners -Canadian. We also have that in other areas - recreational areas - like the Methow. Those people have more standing than our long-term residents.

They have more standing than our long-term residents. They have more importance than our long-term residents. I think that is foolish. Not advocating that you preclude landowners, but you should have residents (on the Planned Area advisory committee) Because we are forgetting ignoring a significant portion of people in this county. That's going to lead to trouble in the long run.

PD - You can still comment, whether you own property or not.....

GT - I'm talking about being on advisory committees who are pertinent to specific areas. Inclusion of a select and few number of residents who are necessarily landowners I think is valuable.

1:13: 04 GM - We kind of(*George T., Gina M.*) we talked about that and got shut down pretty quickly. But I think a good thing about is that Commissioners will appoint the committees. And that makes them able to select long-term residents who have a long -term presence or commitment to that area. Not wide open to....

1:13: 30 - George - Look at the bullet point. It says Landowner interest. It's in the formation, not necessarily the committee. Not wrong to talk to other people. Look below that 2nd paragraph "a diverse advisory committee of individuals owning property. Doesn't specify anywhere room for a resident. That's a problem.

1:14- SB - So just the two words need to be eliminated, "owning property."

1:14:05 GT - Yes. . You address the opportunity a for a resident to be included in the process.

GM & GT: Without an opportunity, there is no appointment. BOCC cannot appoint them to committees with this language included.

1: 14: 13 - Albert - When it comes to a point in time when the interest from either the Methow or North County or whenever it is, when the people are starting to petition the Commissioners to appoint the committee to do this, that's when that grassroots from that area, their voice needs to speak up to the commissioners a that time that those interested and those people Get a spot on Their voices have to speak so those people get a place on the advisory committee.

1:14:57 - GT - I think this language precludes that opportunity.

1:15: : GM - Yeah. I make a vote here to add "and residents who can demonstrate a long-term commitment"

1:15:10 - GT- Yes.. Without an opportunity, there is no possibility. (Silence) It's that the county commissioners have the sole opportunity to appoint an advisory committee, but if the language constrains them to appoint only property owners, that's not a possibility.

PD - But we also don't want people who don't live there at all.

GT - Have we not both been consistent in saying "long term residents."

1:15:52 - AR - Ok, so to be sure that that's what it is, something like a note to the Commissioners to check the language in the RCW's that allows the county commissioners to create a committee....

1:16:14 (PD, interrupting) I don't disagree with you, but I'm sitting here wracking my brains, Angie - do you remember...in some state statute.....

1:16:19 -Angie - I don't remember a state statute pertaining to this. I do remember you all having a lengthy conversation about it.

PD -... I know we've had this conversation a number of times, and there's some reason it is that way.....

1:16:44 - GT - Until I see that in writing, I still feel that it's an important point to pursue.

1:16:54 - PD - I agree with you.

GT - Good thank you for your support.

PD - I'm just.....I know we've had this conversation multiple times. And we've never changed it for some reason.....I'm not opposed to changing it as long as it's representative people from the area.

GT - That's incredibly important. They must be from the region....

PD - But I'm not sure - that's going to take some research. (*Note taker was present during those conversations, and it was not done because AR had stated that "this is the way we've always done it."*)

Palmer - I'll have to check my notes.

(People talking over each other.)

1:17:35 - GT- I'd say make a strong recommendation to the commissioners.....

GM (Interrupting) I sort of feel that the commissioners are going to act like a screen against appointing people who just pop up and want to get in the middle of things. They will select people who have been there and are known in the community.

1:17:50 GT - Yes, I think so, but I think the language that is there precludes that possibility. So I think it's important to include language that gives the opportunity for the commissioners to have that flexibility.

AR - I'll put on a post-it note to the Commissioners make sure they check it or they can talk to the attorney.....

(Several people speaking at once.)

Changing the boundaries of a MCPA

Gina - On same page -and this came from Isabelle's comments - a few words that need to be struck in order to even allow the MCPA to be extended down valley. In first paragraph. "The goals and policies developed within in MVCPA shall apply only to the geographic area of the , and the words that need to come out are: at the time of MVMCPA plan adoption.. These words preclude the possibility of extending the MVMCPA.

AR - Which plan?

SB - So why would you want to take those words out?

1:19:25 - GM - Because the words would preclude extending the boundary of the MVMCPA down through the Lower Valley.

SB - But if you are going to change your plan, then in the new plan adoption, you could extend the boundaries

GM - Well, there's not really a good reason to have those words and that's because

PD *-(Interrupting)* Actually there is, because it's a

(SB Interrupting....and so it doesn't.....)

PD (Interrupting) it says "at the time of adoption..... as adopted at that time. So that says the boundaries are this as adopted at this time. So if you adopt a new plan, with new boundaries then those boundaries will be the boundaries adopted at that time.

AR - There's nothing to say they can an adopt plan X and the next day a new group wants to come in and adopt plan X plus one.

1:20:25 - GT - So then I would advise that we then have a sentence that says if you need to make boundary adjustments, then you just re-adopt the plan. If you are not clear of the procedure, it's less likely that people will see it in that way.

1:20:51: PD - It says it right down in the next one ...it says "Designation criteria." Look at - that's how you designate a new one. You don't want to throw that one away, you just need to.....

GT - We need a sentence in there that says, "If you need to make boundary adjustments, then you do the following steps."

AR - If it doesn't say you can't make boundary line adjustment, then adjustments can be made. If the rule doesn't say explicitly that you can't do something, then you can do it.

GT - I agree with Gina. The sub part there says at the time of plan adoption. It's difficult.

GM - Yeah, you don't even make the plan until you have its boundary lines identified.....

AR - Right now you have...How was it then, uh.....

VH - Well, they had it at the school district boundaries. Where the district changes to Pateros. (Gold Ck)

AR - So those were the boundaries at the time of adoption. Now if they want to take it down to river they can petition and get the etc the

VH - *(something about the Pateros area. Can't hear clearly.)*

Angie - If you'll need a new legal description with any boundary anyway..... That will go with your plan.

GM - (To Angie) - So you don't see this language as interfering at all with expanding the MVMCPA? '

Angie - No, I don't.

AR - Dave - any comments? No, once I started thinking about those people in Sub Unit A, I get all wrapped up . Those people - they paid for all the water cost and studies- it was very costly. That's what they put together for their Sub Area, and that's all I will say.

Alternatives & Decision on Preferred Alternative

Summary: Dart eliminates Alt 4 because of no map. PD and VH advocate for Alt 2. McCoy introduces mix & match possibilities for Preferred Alternative and states that if this plan does not protect senior water rights, it has failed. AR: senior water rights would be regulation & doesn't belong in Comp Plan. Lengthy discussion of Nonconforming lots & consolidation of those, Rural vs. Resource designations relating to Transportation corridors/Fire Districts, & City Expansion areas; Focus is on Non-Conforming lots & Rural designations/Transportation corridors/Fire districts. PC agrees on 9 specific statements that reflect compromise between Alt 3 and Alt 2. No map is adopted, adding to confusion because of changes in text of Alt 3. No discussion/vote on whether to send this version of Comp Plan to Commissioners or to address additional issues brought up in public or PC comments, but Roberts states that it will be sent to BOCC as it is, with only changes being related to 9 statements he read.

1:22:40 AR : Any comments on comp plan at this point in time?

PD - Do we need to recommend an Alternative?

1:23: AR - Pete - says yes.

Alternative 4

Angie - Yes, Alt 4 was in original DEIS. No map was ever created for it.

AR- So it was just a side-thought? The heartburn I have with that is that there are so many more regulations for that. Trying to find the various alternatives. Thinks (?) gives a really good synopsis of all 4. In Comp Plan itself, it has a really good....(????) It goes through and talks really extensively about them.

Alternatives 2&3

PD - Heartburn on 3, which stops growth in unincorporated towns. Little towns like Molson , Chesaw - why can't they expand?

Angie - In Alt 2, in 2014 - the area around Loomis was pretty huge. They want to shrink it back.

PD - But for future expansion, I'd rather have it in a place with more infrastructure than somewhere else.

(SB?) When you use only the footprint of little towns,water and legalthese places don't have wells, do they?

Phil - Yes they do. Back in 2014, adjacent to Molson and Chesaw have a lot of non-conforming lots. If we adopt 3, they want you to consolidate lots. What we did in 2014, we incorporated the 5-acre lots that were already there and make them legal.

Verlene H. - the reason I go for Alt 2, Oka county has a bunch of...(nonconforming lots?) The process is to go through a plan alteration. That's why I ???hard on Alt 2 so people can do the plot alterations. I want Alt 2 because I've seen all of these old plats involved in.....and they are all over the county.

George - Can you explain where the other alternatives do not allow for this change?

Verlene - 2 allows for the city expansion for the old towns....(fades out.)

George - So you are saying no provision in Alt 3 or 4?

Verlene - Can't point to anything. Bolinger plat in Methow is a good example - assessor decides to put them all together instead of making them legal. I had to intercede at that point.....

Phil - Alt 3 "Where possible, consolidation of non-confirming lots...." So you have the Molson / Chesaw area - all 5-acre lots. That was what we were trying to.....because we have a 20 acre minimum. If building a house you have to buy 4-5 acre lots to comply. We were trying to fix that.

Angie - I think the pc changed a lot of that to 5 acres. I know this doesn't say what the zoning will be but they wouldn't have to consolidate anything.

Phil - the way I read this, they would ask people to consolidate.

Angie - I don't think that was the intention. More intended for the further out areas where there are a bunch of tiny lots that maybe could be considered into 5 acres so they could get water. I think a lot of....

George - Not an issue then.

Phil - Only concerned about the wording that they were to try to consolidate were possible.

George - "Where possible?" There's a lot of leeway there.

Mix and Match Option for Alternatives

Gina - We could also do some mixing and matching and create our own alternative. What I like about Alt 4 is the rural designations. I think . Alt 2 is to plan not to plan; that it will be done by market forces. There is just not enough water out there to support spiraling (?) development into the future. We have to think. Even Alt 4the only water that is even out there is what is there.

If this plan does not protect senior water rights, it has failed. I don't see the other alternatives doing this. Wells going dry is taking away their water rights.

AR -- You are talking about regulation. Doesn't belong in the Comp Plan. We talk all about water in this Comp Plan. You can't tell people they can't drill, that's a regulation.

Verlene - AR is right.

George - Protecting water rights - that was a goal. Done and approved by state. (WRIA 49)

Gina - isn't there an interim forbiddingpeople's wells going dry. Coming up with a plan that says that market forces will decide is exactly NOT planning.

SB - Alt 4 protects Ag, Forests, minerals, etc the best and gives guidelines with legal and physical water. I like it. It's more of a descriptionwith more....only 3 rules designations would be necessary for this county, not 4. Like 5 acre lots, it will be residential. I'd like ???Phil's place to be protected from 500 people putting up houses. If we can't protect nice farms like yours...we need to do that. Alternative 4 protects the farms.

Roberts - One lot and a new house is just as bad as 1 house and 100 on a hillside.

Schultz - We wanted development to be in Twisp, so Ecology decides to take away all of Twisp's water. Then the elopement moved everywhere except Twisp. We have State and Federal agencies that screw things up, and we have to go to court we have houses on top of hills, etc.

George - Which one of these would give the cities and towns the priorities? I'm using that caution word - we will have to stand up to the state and say it's in our Comp Plan, it's our vision - we have to stand up to the state.

George - would like to see the general conversation go on. - likes the idea of more finely divided.....rural designations.

Al - We got sued over having too many rural designations because it didn't protect rural lands adequately. They should be either rural lands or resource lands. We had designations that didn't comply with GMA and were ones we made up rather than words that were common for planning.

We got slammed when we tried to designate 1, 2, 5's....a major part of the lawsuit was that we didn't follow that ??????About our designations.

(Unknown) - If we go to 4, we'll get sued again.

George - Within that rural designation, when you look at zoning we can have

Roberts - They screamed that we can't designate those in Comp Plan. So can we dice this up? We just have rural designation as we do now. Take out the 4 and recognize areas within the rural environment to protect rural assets and avoid conflicting uses.

George - How to achieve those goals?

AR - Avoiding conflicts for Ag lands is the goal. Wants to take Ag land piece and add it to Alt. 3. I don't like the idea of 4, where the city expansion areas are designated....I don't think the Comp Plan should designate their expansion areas.

(Speaker?) They do.

Roberts - This sounds like they are designating them. Could we use "adopt?"

(Dart ?) It's trying to take the expansion areas that the cities have submitted to the county. Expansion areas are already somewhere and are already adopted. Does the comp plan need to acknowledge that?

Sal - It's just saying that they are designated.

Angie - The city picks the boundary, and then their comp plan puts some designations in that area for future planning so that when they annex, there is something.

Dart - Any reason to have that in the Comp Plan?

Angie - Could we coordinate? I think it's important to have it.

Unknown - Say cities designate expansion areas.

Dart - Sounded like we were designating the areas.

Roberts? Say ...cities designate expansion areas? Takes away the 4 areas?

Dart and Schulz - there must be a map for Alternative 4

Dart - The problem I have with #4 is because there is no map. I like 2 better than 3. To Adopt 4 without having a map to look at.....I'd like to pull out what we like from #4 and add it to 3. Would have to adopt something and then look at the map and say it's horrible.

Roberts - Wouldn't the map be the same?

Schulz - Says you are right. You need that map.

Dart - Would want to see a map before choosing 4.

Nonconforming lots

Verlene - I can't stress enough - the lots that were never consolidated ...went all the way down to....we did a plat alteration. Ruby is still a plat. They are all over the county. I keep going back to Alt 2 because of that.

Roberts - They exist now but if you want to build on one, you can't build on them.

Schulz - It's a mess.

Verlene - There were 700. Allows the process to take care of it.

Sal are you saying we can't change those plats?

Verlene - you can change them, but they are already existing.....that's why I go to Alt 2. A lot of people who.....

Sal - Alt 2 - it would make it so they would just build house on a weird little lot. It would be the same for all - Alt 2, 3, 4. Someone in zoning would be.....

Angie - comes down to Public Health laws.

Schulz - they 've done that many times.

Dart - but the thing is that we are trying to regulate in the Comp Plan. Alt 4 says you have to have rural designations. And going in and saying the expansion areas have to be designated. This is a guide. I like 2 because it guides us where we need to be. We are going to write th zoning codes. I'm sure we'll look at it again.

Combination of Alternatives Discussed, especially in terms of rural designations and fire districts

George (? Can't hear.) Something puts a lot of pressure on county.....to protect recreational areas, Water quality....until we can enforce our zone code, it's always going to....All laughing about enforcement. It sounds like we are somewhere in 2, 3, and bits of 4.

Phil - I like 2 the most. If we take out the part about market forces. Shouldn't be a restricted plan. Should give us a good zoning plan. Don't want 4 more rural designations.

George - wants 3, with elements of 4. Would promote long-term commercially viable.

Roberts - It's not in alt 2. Would request if we go with 2, we take out of Alt 3 a section about Or take part of 4 - Will promote long-term economic commercially viable agriculture.

Dart - Says add that to Alt 2. Agreed seem to be George, Roberts, Verlene?

Roberts - I'm just going ahead and adding it to Alt 2.

Sal - It fits better into 3.

Phil - We want 2 &3 and parts of (?4?)

Gina - Strongly supports 3 , which says only major transportation grids and not into Fire Districts.....the cost of protecting all these far-flung structures is exorbitant in addition to services.

Dart - Describes his district and the number of areas with no fire protection, but his district covers over 1/2 of it. 3 times the size of our out district - No man's land. Talks about Loomis area. If you are trying not to have rural designations in a fire district, you are cutting out.....names various highways. Driving through huge areas with no fire districts, but have transport, power, and waterbut no fire district. So how can you define rural area by saying (???) No fire Dist???

You can't have a rural designation in that area? (I don't understand this at all.) People can't be in a rural designation because there is no fire district there.

Pete - So it boils down to fire district. Can't protect your investment. Outside fire district would be "resource."

Dart - Pontiac Ridge is not in a fire district. No equipment, no training.

Sal - Outside fire district, would be resource. Larger lots, and inside...slightly smaller sized lots?

AR - If you take out fire district language it would work.

How water fits in

Gina - If we aren't using this as an opportunity to try to direct people into the towns and cities, we are not dealing with water. Ground water is about played out. There may be a few places in the county where that isn't the case. Physically and legally available ground water is just a pipe dream. So encouraging development all over the place is just borrowing people to pay Paul. ??? Is the only way to plan for water for development.

George - But what I don't like about follows only the transportation grid, etc.....it's in 2 also . Transportation grid.

Dart - this doesn't bother me as much as not being within a fire district or critical area becomes a regulation. Following transportation grid

Proposal: George - There's more protection in 3 or 4. I'd like to compromise on 3 and add that in. Take what Al wrote and take transportation grid and strike the rest of the sentence.

SB - Wants it read again: "County will promote commercially viable agriculture, forest, recreational, and mineral uses. Period. And cuts out fire districts and Critical Areas. CAO will fix that.

Map of 3 - Doesn't capture.....

Gina - if remove the sentence about not extending into fire districts, that really changes the

Dart - Difference in not having rural in fire districts - there is nothing on maps that shows this.

Gina - looking at that, the block of yellow is going up Bonaparte Creek - there is no water up there for development. Let's get real.

Others - we are talking about designations.

George - I like 3 because it doesn't set me up for.....

Dart - I like 2 because it follows what is actually on the ground rather than what we wish we had on the ground.

Gina - It can get a lot worse . The water shortage can get worse and worse and worse.

Dart - But it doesn't change that there are already houses there.

Gina - we are not trying to take houses away. We are trying not to get others to take water away from the houses that are there.

Dart- we are saying the designation is already there.

Roberts - what's in #2, is all of this developed already?

Dart - No , but a good percentage.

George - If we leave it yellow, it will encourage more people to move there.

Sal - Palmer Lake...not all yellow....etc.

Verlene - talks about an area where some lots haven't been built on.

Sal - More than 20,000.

2:29:30 : Verlene - We are going to see that throughout the whole county.

Dart - We already have the 5 acre lots. Designating as resource land isn't going to change that. If the maps show what's there already, it doesn't mean they can build all they want - are still going to have to prove water, sewage, etc. It won't matter how many lots they have, they still can't build if there's no water.

2:30:01 - SB - So you want the map of #2, but the modified language of #3?

PD - Yes.

SB - I can agree with that.

George - We think have to let the language generate the map. We can look at these all we want. What will the map look like after we implement the language?

Dart - Seriously, I think we need to need to take the restriction out of Alt 3 re fire districts, etc. The map will reflect Alt 2.

SB - What do you think, Pete?

PP - Following, I think you're on a good roll.

More jokes.

Motion to Adopt Alternative 3 with changes:

George: with the modifications we've put into 3, I'd support and recommend to BOCC. Not a motion.

SB- I'd make a motion.

2:31:08 GT : Moves: Take the Alt 3 with amendments we've discussed and have that as a recommendation to the Commissioners.

SB - Second

PH - Can I suggest an amendment?

AR - Have motion and a second. We can now have discussion on the Motion.

Phil - If we use map of Alt 2, I'm all for it.

2:31:46 : George - The words will dictate what the map looks like. Let's see what that looks like. (Confirming that map is not included in his motion ..)

Summary: Wording of Motion approving choice of Alternatives called into question. Discussion of wording changes in Alt 3 approved by vote of 5-1.

2:31 - AH I was just hoping that maybe when you made the motion you could summarize the changes? But....it's fine.

AR reads changes relating to transportation grid etc.

2:33 - Gina - Clarification, Please? *(Calls attention to sentence Roberts needed to retract)*. You dropped a whole sentence - is all of this gone as well? You dropped the whole sentence of "outside fire distress," etc.

Phil - That's what he said, Yes .

George: I thought we only left off (reads) Reinstate: follows only transportation grid.

Gina - That's what I thought.

AR - Agrees to retract the first part

Rocky (?) Do you think it would be a big deal like if we read the whole thing over again? We should really include the whole thing, to capture in minutes tomorrow.

2:36:14 AR - Reads Alt 3 as modified.

*Changes Rural resource and recreation resource Destinations used in 2014 plan to Ag Resource and Timber Resource

* City expansion areas are designated.

*Rural designation follows only major transportation grid.

* Rural designation does not capture areas already showing urban characteristics that are off the major transportation grid .

- * While Alt 3 considers the historically low population growth in the county, it relies upon cities and towns and their expansion areas to serve most of population growth.
- * Larger lot sizes desired in Resource designation to avoid conflicts with agriculture operations and minimize risk to residential structures from wildfire.
- * Uses regulations where possible for the consolidation of nonconforming lots to achieve higher proportions of large lots in the rural areas.
- * County will promote long-term, commercially viable Agricultural , Forest, Recreational, and mineral uses .
- * Relies on other regs like CAO, SMP, along with connection between density and available water to direct growth

Someone says thank you..

2:36: Compliments to (Morgan and Rocky?) Laughter. People talking over each other.

2:36: 58 GT - We have a motion on the floor, right?

AR - Right

2:37:00 AR - Any more Discussion on the Motion? (Pause)

DS - Call for the question

Vote to approve choice of alternatives:

2:37:17: MOTION RE alternatives, as stated by AR: - All those in favor of the motion, as stated and read, of Alternative 3, using map 2, signify by saying Aye and raising your hand at the same time. (Five) *(Note that Map 2 was not stated in the motion by Thornton.)*

Opposed? (Pause)

2:37:35 - GM: Um. Yeah.

2:37:41 - "One opposed. The ayes have it. We will send this off to the Commissioners. *(No vote was taken as to sending to Commissioners as is.) "*

Female voice. Perfect.

AR - Thank you, everybody.

2:37:46 - (George?) Move to adjourn (not seconded? Too many people talking.)

2:37:51 Gina - No, I thought that motion was(Chatter covering up Gina. She is ignored)

2:37:50 Gina responds - No, I thought that motion was only relative to....(Saying she thought they didn't vote on sending to Commissioners.) (She is ignored.) I actually voted on the Comp Plan....

2:38:02 - (Can't hear - people talking over Gina, including Pete.)

2:38:01 - AR - Before everybody packs up and leaves.....is there anything else we need to discuss this evening?

(Female voice) - NO, that's everything we had. Everyone talking over each other.

2:38:05 Gina saying, I actually only voted to.....On actually sending the Comp Plan,

2:38:07 - AR -(Talking over Gina) Our next regularly scheduled meeting date is on our regularly scheduled date. No surprises.

(People talking over each other - Phil says he has a suggestion, but Pete also starts talking . At least 3 people talking at once.

2:38:15 - Pete - (Changes subject, talking over Gina & Phil, hard to hear) we are focusing.... Just so there won't be any surprises, we are focused on..... and we will have a whole new plan in front of you guys to forward , not sure if it's CAO, or what will be comin' at you guys, but that will be the surprise. (Loud giggling.)

2:38:44 - Phil: I'd really like to stack up all the comments and burn them in the parking lot. As a fire practice.

(Woman's voice over Phil, giggling/laughing) - "I thought we were over the stress."

Disagreement as to whether PC vote included a vote to pass on the Draft to Commissioners at this time. (Re vote on motion as stated by AR at 2:37:17 vs motion proposed by GT at 2:31:08 .

2:38:53 (George - *acknowledging Gina's efforts*) Gina brings up a good point - Did we make a recommendation to send the Comp Plan as we have worked on it to the County Commissioners? AH - Yes.

2:38: 55 - GM - I thought the vote was pertaining to choosing the Alternative. It wasn't clear that it was also sending it to the commissioners.

AR - Well.... (Laughter.)

PD - Once we agreed on the Alternative, that kind of.....

2:39:15 GM - I don't think we ever.....

PD - Do we need a motion to uh....?

2:39 - AR - No, that was stated in the motion. Stated in the vote.

George - Ok.

2:36:52 AR - Adjourned at 9:27.