

BOCC Notes
Wednesday, 12/29/2021

Review and Approval of County Comprehensive Plan
And other issues

Present:

Chris Branch - District 1, Chair
Andy Hover - District 2, Vice Chair
Jim DeTro - District 3
Lalena Johns - Clerk of the Board

Members of the public attending via AV Capture

Lorah Super
Isabelle Spohn

The following notes were taken by an Okanogan County Watch volunteer via AV Capture. Every attempt is made to be accurate. Notes are verbatim when possible, and otherwise summarized or paraphrased. Note taker comments or clarifications are in italics. These notes are published at <https://countywatch.org> 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. Time stamps below are in a real time. To locate specific topics, a click on the AV Capture video screen at <https://okanogancounty.org/avcapture.html> can assist in finding the correct spot on the video recording. Page numbers refer to Comp Plan draft , 11/4/2021.

Summary: It's established that Commissioners may make changes to Comp Plan under Growth Management Act statutes if the changes are considered non-substantive or typographical/grammatic errors, thus avoiding a public hearing. Commissioner Branch leads the discussion & answers questions proposed by Hover. **Comp Plan discussion:** Water section, WRIAs, a few Wildfire issues, Agri-tourism/Agri-business, re-appropriation of relinquished water rights, MCPA's and criteria for Advisory Groups, Tunk and Methow Valley issues, criteria for Sub Area Advisory committees, reflections and reminiscences on Comp Plan. Comp Plan adopted. with a change as to who deals with relinquished water. **Future actions:** Likelihood of external counsel for zoning ordinance update; strategic planning; Critical Areas ordinance; Moratoria on building, subdivision, and marijuana due in Jan and Feb. **Executive session:** repealing Resolutions #119- 2014 and #31-2015. 2014 Zone Code adoption issue, and questions re lawsuit. **Public hearing** on county redistricting.

Casual Discussions & Miscellaneous issues until Hover arrives late due to weather. Public had trouble getting into WebEx Zoom for Planning Commission meeting. Possibly cold weather and snow?

9:20 - Discussion on whether the Ordinance repeals the 2014 Comprehensive Plan (Discussed again later.)

9:26- Discussion of what was in the lawsuit on the Com Plan of 2014:

AH has questions on what the lawsuit says: Lawsuit on 2014 comp plan focused on certain areas. One was water. Was there more, or was it primarily on the water?

PP - Mostly on the water, but that leads to other things. (Not clear whether they are talking about the lawsuit and stipulation of the Yakama Nation or the lawsuit by Futurewise and MVCC.)

About 9:30: Review of water section of Comp Plan, Discussion of Environment and Natural Resources element, p. 16

Shorelines

WRIAS 5.3. - Spells out 7 different WRIAs, focus is on 48 and 49

AH - If not a substantive change, we don't need to remit back to PC? Instead of saying "all plans" here, it might list them.

Brief, detailed discussion, general discussions about how to proceed. General talk about policies. Discussion again: that unless there are substantive changes they don't have to bump it back to Planning Commission.

CB - Long suggestion of language that covers compliance with state regulations.

Addresses AH - If there is something that you want to accomplish that we don't have space for...that is of concern. But if we have the space, we can continue and use every tool we have. (?)

9:40 - Discussion of whether Comp Plan states that it's our policy to follow state law

AH - Show me the place where it shows Okanogan County follows state law.

PP - It references state law throughout the documents, and this was designed to cover initial requirements of state laws.

CB - Interrupting. See p. 6, Relationships to Other Plans, Statutes, and Regulations. Also, see p.59. That's why I say throughout the document there are references to laws we are dealing with. G-4, p. 9 - "shall periodically review (names all plans) as required by state law."

AH - So G-5 covers it.

9:47 - Study of Water Resource Inventory Areas

Going back to p. 18, 1.1 (reading)

CB - WR-2 - STUDY OF WRIAS (Water Resource Inventory Areas) - There were comments about that. I think it was remedied here? Went back to fact that there were not specific studies of WRIAs and it was noted that there were studies that are being done. Several goals here that I think talk about us working through information and educational materials to establish aquifers, etc. and unconsolidated nature of WRIAs 48 & 49, and in other areas they don't have that.

9:50 AH - Skipping to Wildfire issues

The CWPP (Community Wildfire Protection Plan) was not in the list on **G-4, p. 9**. Looking to find reference to it.

CB- The CWPP is an "optional" plan.

AH - Asks for Maurice (Goodall.) (*No one knows if he's here.*)

PP - That was one of the comments we made. He said they were not doing a CWPP so they are doing the All Hazards Mitigation Plan (AHMP) instead. It does not encourage or negate. Cites study out of WASU, they even interviewed people - thinks Isabelle was one of those interviewed. CWPP's should be site- specific

PP P. 39, FEIS -Talks a little bit about it being prepared with other documents.

CB -The Important things is that it's either current or it isn't. The AHMP is the one we have to do to access \$\$to get the \$\$ (*for grants?*) THE CWPP could have been highly encouraged. But it also talks about availability of options. Compare it here to making our emergency response in this building to make it secure. It's an example. We don't have a plan like that, but certain departments deal with it on their own. I'd say CWPPs are a part of that, if that helps at all.

JD - One comment says the AHMP is now the MHMP (Multi-hazard Mitigation Plan.)

CB Not sure the MHMP is required, but if you want federal funding you have to do that.

Long Silences.

CB - I know there are concerns about that, so I know where you are coming from, Cmr. Hover. One thing - Comp Plan and goals and objectives there - I really like not locking ourselves into something that could change. We have a goal of protecting property that could be at the beginning of efforts to get funding. I would say that with these goals we have, we could use them to get grants.

9: 55 - Timeline for Comp Plan Needed

AH - What was the history on this? Do we have the timeline from before you were director?

PP - The recitals captured the history. There were not a lot of documents in order that we could go back to.

AH - I was talking about timeline for whole Comp Plan.

Just before 10:00:

PP tries to go over problems, timelines, etc. "When I came onboard, it was too short, very vague, and then I started over again. It's gone from 91 to 61 pages.

#1-4 in recitals talks about the plan we operate under.

CB - History - knowing the timeline would be good. We should look at doing a “story line” like USFS is doing. He talks about Sheriff Jim Weed, who saw people burning the 1964 plan in the street. He likes the USFS story lines. I have been hearing concerns for many years - many concerns are the same - back when , to have zoning you had to have a Comp Plan. People ask me what a Comp Plan is for. In Oroville, testimony (*on 2009 plan*) there contained a lot of irrelevant stuff. Pontificates.....

10:00: Confusion over whether changes can be made to Comp Plan at this point:

AH - What I’m getting is “Don’t make any changes” Because ...Is it any change, no matter how slight, that has to go back through the process?

PP - We can do grammatical errors. Other changes have to go back to a public hearing, but not in front of PC.

10:06 - CB - If it changed the intent of the plan, I’d say we need a hearing. Have a little concern: It’s a living document. Nothing to say - if there is nothing in this plan that allows us to change the plan, we need to add that. There was reference in beginning of Futurwise comments to the way the EIS worked and a case in Skagit county - a rezone. I must say that if there is a rezone of any significance. ...if the Comp Plan didn’t support ski hill, a rezone could have been done and do a reference to the Comp Plan at the same time. They could have gone through that process.

JD - Maybe that’s the way Arrowleaf got in.)

CB - I’m sure, probablyAnecdote regarding a refinery case somewhere else.

10:10 Does Comp Plan support Agri-tourism and Agri-business?

10:10 AH - Do you think this Comp Plan supports agribusiness and agritourism? (Seems to be directed to Branch. Ie - Rural Bed and Breakfast, Farm tours, etc?)

CB. - To me, it’s an open door.

AH - (Finds a few places in which the Plan could support Agri-tourism.)

10:12 - PP - **has found the cite on revisions without requiring a public hearing:** “GMA allows for revisions without a public hearing if no substantive change is made.”

CB - When I worked on Comp Plans: keep goals and objectives relevant to vision statement and make goals and objectives flexible. But revisit every section of the plan. I’ve had it done where someone took the housing section and used it to further their effort and then you had to look at other parts of the plan.

10:13 - PP: Planning has evolved so much over the years - keep it broad enough so you can plug your projects in there and not prevent economic development. Leave it broad enough over the years so things can fit in. Then, a lot was driven by private projects and people would challenge etc. But now there are more specific plans. Community visions is where the Comp Plan comes from. Whether it addresses wildfire, etc.

CB - For “professional worriers:” you are looking at specific project review. For those who are concerned about something being addressed by Comp Plan - it doesn't take away from projects going through SEPA for review.

10:16 - WATER RIGHTS: Who has authority to decide the recipient of reappropriated water that has been relinquished? (Change is made by Commissioners in this part of the Comp Plan.)

First or second portion - where water rights within the county have been lost through relinquishment, legal relinquishment, I think, support the reappropriation by third parties. But here is no one but the DOE that can support relinquished waters. Is it really meaning things like transfer of sale? Or should it be.....????

CB - No, because it says lost. And second part - reappropriating water that was already lost - it has potential, because you might go and buy water rights. Re-appropriation to me won't allow.....

AH - Wait, wait. You are complicating this. I cannot support the reappropriation of such water by 3rd parties for use in Okanogan county. I say we change 3rd parties to WDOE. That's the only one that can support relinquish water. If we want to What if you see other entities that come into the county trying to reappropriate water that has been lost?

CB - We can't do that.

AH - Then why is that statement in there?

CB - I don't know what they really meant. You are making

AH - I don't support it. It's not legal. Shouldn't we remove this statement?

We could say “reappropriate by the WDOE.”

CB - I would support changing it to please your concerns. (And so on...)

10:21

AH - Change “3rd parties” to “WDOE.”

CB - We have another conflicting statement.

AH - It doesn't matter. DOE can take the relinquished water right and re-appropriate it downstream. Whether they do it or to is up to them. (Considering instream flows.)

10:23 - CB: What I would suggest is.....consideration should be given to the reallocation of water rights in the Dept. of Ecology....

AH - It's not just that, but it's about moving forward. You are making it a lot more difficult than necessary.

CB - I don't have a problem with that.

AH - Clarifies that we are not supporting some other companies coming in and buying rights.....
.....

We will put that change in.

PP - States that Phil (Dart - Planning Commission) brought this up at the PC meeting. They felt the water rights should go back to the original owners. They had issues with this statement.

10:26 - **AH** - Say it's lost through relinquishment and Ok county supports DOE. We can support the water going back to them through the process to get water rights re-established. And that is what I would do as a commissioner....lobby them....if water rights had been given up, to reappropriate that water back within Ok county, hopefully to that person, or to someone downstream in Okanogan county.

CB - **We have agreed to the change.**

10:26 CRITICAL AREAS p. 24 (Recital #36)

Discussion among AH, PP, and CB regarding "clarification" of recital #36 in accordance with WDFW's comments, regarding maintaining populations so that habitat is sufficient and isolated sub-habitats are not created, and to balance the regulation of HCA's within the means of existing resource acuities such as agriculture, grazing, forestry, and mining. WAC 365.196 & 365.190. Changes are to CA 2.1 and CA 1.4.

Support for Agricultural Tourism (again)

CB : Rural 2, p. 31 specifically uses "Ag tourism. P. 29 A

AH - Everything else...as you say, you leave the door open for things yo've needed to do. As you say, for people worrying about the Comprehensive Plan - we are saying Yes, we encourage those things!

10:39 : MCPA'S and Community Wildfire Protection Plans

p. 36 - There is language here to support adding Sub Areas. (May complete and adopt.) Purpose statement.

CB - that opportunity also provides opportunity to do CWPP's within those planning areas. Again the research they did spoke to the fact that a lot of people move into areas. "Over there," acceptance of rules is different from people in the Highlands - who are not open to regs, but open to plans they develop themselves. Other people coming from other areas and are used to having

regulations. That's what "the study" showed (*Travis Paveglio's study?*) - Not very accepting of others creating rules where they want to make their own. "

Could people in MCPA's could spend \$\$ of their own on additional plans rather than on litigation?

CB - To put this in , we are doing justice to the people in various areas of the county . We will have to talk about how we are involved. It's a concept I've talked about with with Pete - If there's people in areas of the county that feel the plan doesn't go far enough, the MCPA's can be done...and possibly rather than spending \$\$ on litigation, they can come up with plans of their own and contribute to the cost of those - obviously they have money, because they are spending it on litigation. That's how the "Collaborative" operates. (*Referring to Okanogan-Wenatchee NF Collaborative, of which he is Chair.*)

JD - People choose where they want to live.....(*mentions Mazama Advisory Committee.*)

CB - That's great, it's relevant to people who have moved there from other ares.

10:42 AH - But if you think of people in Molson, what do they cherish? We have full-timers (*old timers?*) there - we don't want to see things cut up here.

CB - That's what "that study" showed. (*Paveglio's sociology study regarding fire?*)

Palmer quotes attorneys as to changes in the Comp Plan.

CB /Pete – As we previously discussed, these types of changes are explicitly allowed in the context of the GMA without an additional hearing. These provisions do not expressly apply to the Planning Enabling Act. However, there is at least an argument that the County should be able to rely on these exceptions that allow for changes without an additional hearing. **In balance, we think the risk is higher to not include the changes, than to make these changes without a hearing. (Quoting contracted attorney Jenna Mandel.)**

NEED FOR REGULATIONS - philosophizing

AH - Yes, same people that don't want regs..... but they don't want those trailers and RV's, etc. That's regulation. That's what it is for. At some point there is a balance. I've seen a lot of places that don't have building codes, and let me tell you, the way people figure things out is incredible. Drive around Anchorage to Soldotna. Whatever you can transport on a barge can build a house. If you don't have some regulations about how things can be built when you want to sell it , no one wants to buy it. So at some point, you have to do things correctly

1:46 PP - A part of regulation has to have the spin-off of enforcement. We have some right here where people have been inventive and it causes issues of health and safety, etc.

AH - We all have the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness- all of us. ...but when my rights infringe upon others' rights, you have to have justice that needs to be done (laws and branches of gov't balance of powers.)

10:45 - Discussing Conclusions

AH - Other than that one, which I'm pretty adamant about (relinquishment issues being up to WDOE) which I know as on there as, I think, a grammatical error , after going through questions (agri-tourism, not over- regulatory in water section, etc) I think it's fine.

CB - In my review, I wanted to be sure it wasn't regulatory. Does everyone agree?

AH - I point to the lower Methow having 1-acre zoning for eons. I say Let's change it. Do we really want one acre zoning in steep areas, neighbors close, etc ?- and it went through. Now we start looking at zone code. Look at Tunk - lots of consternation. What do we want to look at there? Go further - in Comp Plan , affordable housing. This will be the tough one. Hard in the Methow. (???/Couldn't hear.) Now it's in black and white. It will have to be Muti-family dwellings. Interior walls are way cheaper than exterior walls. And so when we talk about city expansion areas that are now in the county, within Twisp and Winthrop, where are we getting water? If we say ok on CEA's it has to be pretty dense.

(10-Minute Recess)

10:56 - Discussion: Palmer and Gecas say they will consider the changes in language about DOE as either a typographical error or non-substantive change.

10:59 - Brief discussion between CB and LJ regarding **technology problems**, Webex vs Zoom, people not able to attend meetings due to technical issues, especially over Webex.

11:00- Final Discussion

MCPA Advisory Groups

CB -I meant to talk about the MCPA while I was on that section, on makeup of advisory groups - based on a public comment.

AH - Have to be a "Landowner.?" (*Make-up of advisory committees.*)

CB - It doesn't say that, does it?

AH - I think it does.

P. 37 - Future More Completely Planned Areas

CB - Reads "A diverse Advisory Committee of individuals owning property within the proposed MCPA shall lead MCPA planning efforts." (*A slightly different wording from what was approved*)

by PC, apparently changed by attorneys and not noticed during Planning Commission meeting on 11/27.)

LJ - There is a comment (*on zoom.*)

CB. Oh, it's about the same issue - we are not taking comments.

AH - I think one comment was what about people that are renting and can't be.... because you can't find a home *or something like that. (close to work?)* I would say, yeah, but the person who owns the house is the one that will be affected by whatever we come up with . Even though you may want to live there, it's still you are doing things that would affect what it looks like today.

CB. That would be to me a conversation that would take place at the time of appointment. This doesn't say they have to own property to be on the committee.

AH - Only to lead the effort .

CB - Yes, Especially for future MCPA's especially...

AH - Oh, yeah. So you could have a committee made up where the main board was landowners, but the others could be on the committee.

CB - They could be the entire group, at the advisory level, but what would initiate it would be in fact the landowners. And the landowners could also initiate it in favor of the people that live there. So they are looking out for their own renters. -but it doesn't limit it. It's a criteria you establish and establishing that criteria for it.....

11:10 - Establishing the criteria for advisory groups - AH and CB's visions:

AH - I think The main jist of that was that you don't want a bunch of people people that live outside the county being on a committee that makes up a plan.

CB - Yes, I think that was the conversation that happened at the Planning Commission. . In Jim's district there are a lot of Canadian landowners. We'd be handing a lot of involvement to the Canadians. I don't have a problem with that.....

AH - They own land there..... it doesn't matter what nationality they are. They own property there, so it's going to affect them. What I'm talking about is, let's say people from the Methow wanted to be on the board of around Molson. Well that's not going to go over so well.
(Laughter)

CB - The County Commissioners wouldn't make that appointment.

AH - I know that. But that was the jist of the thing ..you don't want people that are not.... um.... invested in the place that they 're making a plan for.

CB - Right, and so my the argument for that is,.....and of course this doesn't say they can't be.....

AH - It only says the ones that lead it ...

CB - But from the standpoint of people being involved in the place they live, but they rent: they are supporting the people who own that property. So they do deserve an opportunity to be a part of something. Especially, some have rented for 30 years straight. But they have no voice in the rules.....

AH - When that was brought up to me, it was that people want to live there, but they don't have the means to get there right now, and they want to have a say in what it looks like before they can actually live there.

CB - The other part of that is, and I've had a lot of conversations with people about affordable housing and so forth there are people in this world who don't want to be landowners, they don't want to be property owners, they are paying rent to live there, and they live there and are a part of the community.

And so that's the part where I saw concern, and so I do say again, I support this language here and it's mainly because "they" shall lead these efforts. Say, for example, if I was a renter and there was only 10 renters neighbors and there's a lot of crime in my neighborhood. And we want to influence the way the rules are written for our neighborhood because we see everyone using their front yards as their driveways. (But they are all renters.) But they need voice.....and some of them rent there for a really long time. And so I would say they deserve the opportunitylandowners come in and say we want a whole sub area advisory committee.... they are influenced and should be influenced by their renters for the advisory committee. And so they come in and say we want this process, and....we want our renters to be a part of it.....

AH - So let's just talk about the establishment of one, all right? Because what we are saying though, is that we are saying that 10 renters couldn't come to the board of Commissioners saying that we want to establish an MCPA because then that would be leading that effort?

CB - Right. But I would be inclined, if there was 10 people came in and all were renters and said they wanted to establish an MCPA, I think my first question would be....and I think yours would be too, "Are you trying to do something (*to or through? Couldn't understand him*) your landlord? Have you talked to your landlord, are they doing something.....and then they (*the landlord?*) would be leading the planning effort. And so that's where I go with that. Maybe there was wording at one time that said they could only be landowners.....

AH - And I think that in the 2014 Plan, it had to be 33% or 66% - some high percentage of the land mass owner of an MCPA had to do it.

CB - We can all see where that would lead us.....

AH - Right, and so..... Commissioner DeTro has the largest ranch, and so he can control whatever goes on there....

CB - And so I was concerned that that was understood and to make sure this was not excluding people....

AH - Because there is no criteria about how many people it takes to make an MCPA or anything else, we'll have to really review that. Because like the Lower Methow doesn't have an MCPA. Or maybe they do. When I talked with Isabelle, there were Sub Areas A-D or something like that. So maybe there are already boundaries established... Anyway, we'll have to figure out how many people of the populated area does it take to make regulations?

CB - And who do we actually appoint? We need to have criteria. I'm very fond of this: You must believe that planning is something that we actually do. Otherwise they are there to stymie the process.

AH - Also there is different ideology. "I can do anything I want" vs "this has to stay exactly the way it is this second." "Interviewing people - you want mixture of these people (This is about the Planning Commission.) It's impressive that they came to agree on this.

PP - And in this case, it was a unanimous vote.

11:17 Repealing of 2014 Comp Plan?

AH - So we have an ordinance; it doesn't have the repeal language.

PP - Between now and then I'll make that addition and send to Lanie.

(All agree.)

PP - Gecas said the changes can be grammatical and those that are not substantive.

DETRO'S GRIPES FROM THE PAST

AH - asks (???). You have been here a long time. I know that Agri-tourism is something a person was really worried about it - can't rent a barn out, can't do

JD - I think it's broad

AH - Is there anything else that could cause consternation?

JD - I've hope the issues they've brought in the past are now settled. It's been a long, long road. I was very disappointed when we passed 2014 and we basically gave people in the Methow the full range of what they wanted - I remember Nichole Kuchenbuch and Jason Paulsen were real active on that committee on what they wanted for the Methow. We were supposed to pass it on a Monday and didn't, we passed it on Tuesday instead. ...but they filed a lawsuit on Monday. Because these people(?? Jim is difficult to hear.)

And we all know what happened in an organizational deal. (*No reference to what deal he's talking about.*)

Our basic values and related issues - future actions: wildlife, the land, excessive subdivision, disturbance of wildlife, ATV questions, zoning, water banking and data, etc.

AH - What I value in this county is the wildlife, the land. Having things all cut up is a bummer. This is the part that rubs me raw - people say they can do whatever they want and they cut and run, and you are left with little parcels....like the 20 Acre parcels divided in small pieces who now complain about cattle.

Recognize things are hard - it's not all mismanagement by the game department. It's ski trails thought wintering grounds, more and more mountain bike trails disturbing wildlife, ATV guys. I drive up these USFS roads in my big F350 4x4 and you come across people in sedans. What is the difference between these guys if they are following the laws?

PP - the Volvos are coming in one at a time, and the ATV's are coming in by 300's and all those younger people want to zip up the banks, and you

AH - yea, but This has struck a pretty good balance.... Project review, etc. Next thing is to take a look at the zone code.

AH - One other thing that is in place that 'd like to see. Data base for water usage for the Water Bank (??). I'd like to see it solidified and up and running. I know this Comp Plan has been a big huge item. Being able to put that out, basically showing.....I don't think that will be a real tough deal . We have staff.....

PP - Before we do that, I'd like to sit down with Aspect and get a 1-1 session with them.

AH - Good idea. That piece has been missing for so long. No one tends to believe us that we know how much water has been used, how much is left for mitigation measures in 49. We can track how much is being used to see if our calculations have been correct over time.

11:29 - Setting priorities, Department by Department

CB - To that end.....That's the setting of priorities, looking at it by Department....we obviously have facilities, planing priorities, need to set them.

PP - This also will be set by the stipulation

Zone Code

AH - I'm saying there is low-hanging fruit that will establish credibility. - need to get into zoning right away. Should do some strategic planning on the Zone code using a time line. Do we want the PC to go about it, or give them some ideas what we want them to look at? We will again engage our attorneys. What are the ways - two paths you can use. The PC starts the process then they will hold the public hearings. Not sure if it's same on Zone code as Comp plan.

PP - Usually update are driven by communities' needs. Go ahead with strategic plan and priorities and timelines which would be in stipulation order. We would the draft sections of the regulation. Have PC meet and when everyone is satisfied, have the public hearing. I like setting priorities of what section of code we address first. Certain groups are waiting for this to happen. Good opportunities to bring experts in those groups to the table.

Who gets input/Strategic Planning

AH - This is the place where we could actually go out to solicit some thoughts from MVCC and the Colville - What do you want to change in zoning? Comp Plan is a policy statement. (Mentions a way you can start getting comments. Says you can do this. Put it in front of MVCC and others - and say, "Do you want to do that or not? "

Consultants vs In-House; Moratoriums, Appeals

PP - This is part of the strategic plan process. What we will handle in-house vs what we will hire consultants to do.

AH - We should know that pretty quick, like in the next couple of weeks...we say here is the timeline. Look at the stipulation and order. If we hire consultant to work on zone code while we work on CAO, I am all for that.

PP - So we have 2 moratoriums coming up in January and February - Subdivision and Building, then in February the Marijuana one. 7th, 8th, and 9th of January (or tenth) will be end of appeal period (For these moratoria?) So realistically, with these moratoriums we have gotten to the point that we are saying you have to have legally available water and follow the instream flows. Pretty black and white from there.

CB - I will go back. You have both mentioned several issues. Prioritizing is the strategic planning issue. Might be good to address in specific areas, like Tunk, which has moratoriums attached.

AH to PP: please look at it.

TUNK VALLEY, Priorities, Advisory Committees in Methow?

CB. One issue in Tunk valley - Subdivision: zoning dictates. Might want to prioritize zoning. Will do in pieces in relation to the Plan. Then people won't think it applies everywhere.

PP - And need to start getting the advisory committees going.

AH - Right now, the MCPA's that are in place regulate well enough for now. We need to do something else for now. Might want to contact MAC for any amendments to Sub Area A.

CB - Also establishing our policies

AH - as far as taking minutes, we need to have policies saying what we expect (*for MCPA's?*)

Adjourned for lunch

1:30 - COMP PLAN APPROVAL : Discussion of changes made, review of issues of concern.

AH - We got it all. Where does it say it rescinds previous Comp Plan? (Comp Plan of 2014) At the bottom. We talked about the things that concerned me - Agri-tourism, making sure this is available. Keeping in tact the rural life style, agricultural base, still having guidance for wildlife, etc. Detrol?

JD - Ready to go.

AH motion: - Ordinance 2021-3 - in light of discussion today, move to approve Board adopting Ok Count Comp Plan of Nov 4, 2021 and rescinding (old Comp Plan.)

JD - 2nd.

AH - Amends motion to include : Alternative 3 and associated facts, Findings of fact, Land use map, and Central Facilities map.

Voted on Amendment - All in favor? Unanimous. *Comp Plan has been approved.*

CB - Some people won't like it, but we did it.

OTHER BUSINESS

1:40 - Bond Council engagement letter with Forster Garvey and authorizing Chair to sign. No Discussion.

AH - They are looking at \$15 million. To bond new shops for Tonasket and Twisp area for public works. Including Coroner facility inside the one in Omak. Also relates to Superior Court.

Other business:

LJ - MOU for Title 3 for Okanogan County search and rescue, \$20,000. Title 3 funds. Laura Wright in favor. Outlines uses, and county's actions. Approved.

Lanie said comments for re-districting could come in by e-mail or mail.

CB - to Lanie - was there a time that public comment would close?

LJ - Yes. 1:30 today.

CB - We will stick with the agenda.

1:46 - Reminiscences of Comp Plan History

AH - FEIS was the informative document for us. We don't have to approve, right?

CB - As far as I know, no. The law firm had outlined those approvals. In a lot of ways, the document is the document of the Planning Director. So she's a part of implementing this, and the Determination of

Significance kicks us into a programmatic EIS, and I believe she may have a signature that approves or accepts it.

AH - They definitely responded to all of the comments.

CB - But one of the main things is that it's intended to evaluate the environmental consequences and the mitigations we used to address what the plan creates. We chose this path, and we had alternatives. So what are the results? So much of it kind of boils down to how you deal with the project actions. It sets you up to part of the impacts, but the individual mitigations....

AH - I have some questions now in regards to the rescinding of those other two resolutions. Not sure if they should be asked here or in "there" (Executive Session.)

CB - If you'd like to meet with the attorney, that would be your prerogative.

AH - Dave, please get Dave for Exec. Session.

CB - There's some funny nuances to all that - I think I know what you are getting to.

Executive Session, RCW 110.1(i) ongoing litigation (10 minutes.) with Dave Gecas (Deputy Prosecutor) Primary concern - We just moved to rescind 2 resolutions that were at the apex of certain legal issues we were facing. Resolutions repealed: #119- 2014 and #31-2015

Kit Arbuckle of Okanogan County Republican Party - Says he "Stopped by for the "party."

2:25: 2014 Code adoption: whether county will be sued.

AH - When did we revise Zone Code to 5 acre lots in Lower Valley? We would have had to adopt the entire zone code, right? We adopted the amendment.

CB - We made an amendment to the existing zoning. And just maybe, in the Code revisions - that section at beginning of county code - every time we make an amendment it shows up, only those parts we amend. Used to be you'd get them in chunks and replace those pages. But another piece at the beginning of the Code, which says this code is valid up until this date. We should occasionally update that one Title 1 - preliminary general provisions.

AH - Thinks we had to have adopted the entire zone code.

CB - Why? We should look at it, see if it's codified. If we amended, it's amended. It's our code.

Conversation/Debate continues, morphs into discussion of revision of current code.

AH - Would it be easy for someone who is an outside resource, to read our code for consistency? I think we should do that. We have other stuff.

CB - One of us could do it.

They discuss the process. If they do it every year, it wouldn't be as difficult.

2:33: Redistricting: - Public hearing

2:33 - No Comments on redistricting. Brief discussion that it was not controversial in any way,, simply a numeric decision and follow geographic and other existing boundaries.

Discussion

Redistricting adopted.

2:43: Meeting adjourned.