

BOARD OF OKANOGAN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
01/14/2019

In Attendance at Meeting:

Jim DeTro- JD (BOCC)

Andy Hover - AH (BOCC)

Chris Branch – CB (BOCC)

Lanie Johns – LJ (Clerk of the Board)

Perry Huston - PH (Administrator & Planning Director)

Josh Thompson – JT (Public Works, Transportation Engineer)

Ben Rough – BR (Public Works Administrator)

These notes have been taken by one of several volunteer citizen note takers and published on the website of Represent Okanogan County (ROC.) The notes have been taken as close to verbatim as possible, with any writer's comments or explanations in italics. For officially approved minutes of Board of Commissioner meetings, normally published at a later date, see www.okanogancounty.org.

Note takers comment: Apologies for the number of times the dialog was missed and labeled as 'inaudible'. The commissioners and attendees were asked multiple times during the early part of the meeting to speak into their microphones so they could be heard by the audience. As often occurs, they complied for a while and then seemed to forget to do so.

Summary of significant discussions

Comprehensive (Comp) Plan

The lengthy discussion related to integrating Public Works' transportation infrastructure planning and the development of the Comp Plan. CB repeatedly emphasized the need to establish a policy within the Comp Plan that future subdivision development pay for needed infrastructure. The commissioners agreed that PH, BR and JT should develop a proposal for how the Public Works and Planning departments should work together to arrive at consistency between the planning efforts.

WRIA 49 Watershed Plan Update

The discussion addressed procedures for how the Planning Unit will operate, mostly in regard to its decision-making powers. After discussion, the commissioners decided to allow the Planning Unit to make routine decisions, such as identifying the need for hiring consultants and making selections without the approval of the Initiating Governments.

Tunk Watershed Water Availability Study Area (Unscheduled discussion)

If adopted as a water availability study area, the Planning Department would not accept applications for subdivision of existing parcels within the area while the study was being conducted. CB noted that the public testimony the BOCC has heard has not been substantiated with documentation or studies. AH expressed the desire for a pathway to subdivision during the study period involving mitigation by

applicants for the effects of consumptive water use due to development. PH will bring more information to the next meeting.

Airport Safety Zones – Tonasket Update

A Public Notice has been published, initiating a public review period, evidently on the Environmental Checklist.

Champerty Shores

An unidentified part of the project has been completed. Initiation of the next part was discussed. There is uncertainty whether that can happen until bond money has been acquired. PH may have to discuss other options with the BOCC, perhaps involving the county loaning funds of up to \$25,000. PH is about to put out a RFP for unidentified services.

Update Planning Department

1:30

Comprehensive (Comp) Plan

PH has prepared a flip chart with the following list:

- ❖ Road Standards
- ❖ OCC 16 Subdivision
- ❖ Resolutions
- ❖ Comprehensive
 - Primitive roads
 - Private roads
 - Agency roads

Rapid conversation ensues as the meeting begins. JD is not present. PH describes issues with Transportation, referring to flip chart. AH inquires about road standards for subdivision, pertaining to fire safety – width, slopes, ingress/egress, etc. BR describes standards for roads within subdivisions, including two points of access, and says that fire departments have to approve plan. AH mentions Pine Forest as hazardous. BR says that it was subdivided in the 1980's. AH asks if the standards have changed since then (Yes). PH describes work-arounds by developers – developing small areas within what will become a larger subdivision to get around regulations for (long-plats?). He says that the whole thing is a mess. Understands reluctance to put controls on in the past but feels that now we need to consider cumulative effects.

JT – Cities require that kind of planning, but the county has not. Not all projects require SEPA review.

PH – Several reasons for talking about this. Comp Plan. I identified transportation infrastructure as an EIS issue. JT informs me that we now have funding. (JT mentions specifics – primitive roads analysis, etc.) Sooner or later we need up-to-date road standards. We rely, in part, on International Fire Code. We are using all kind of things – Josh's judgement, subdivision code.

AH – We have talked about this in the past but haven't taken action. Do Comp Plan comments suggest that we need to beef this up in the Comp Plan, or do we take it up in the Zone Code?

PH – All the comments want more specificity. Density follows transportation grid in previous comp plans. Do we need more specificity in the Comp Plan? That is up for discussion.

AH – You said density follows transportation grid. That’s odd. Is that what we want to say?

PH – You shouldn’t put development where you don’t have water. Everyone agrees on the foundation policy but differ on the details. It is the same with the road system. *(Gives an example where ½ hour of rain makes a road virtually impassible)*. If we identify areas where we expect development to go, or where we want it to go... transportation analysis will identify what improvements are needed as development occurs. *(Gives another example of requiring improvements as commercial development occurs)*. Specific mitigation required for specific development projects. This is about how we are going to approach these mitigations.

CB – Comp Plan, there are a few statements that are missing from the 2014 plan. Some of the goals is for development to pay its own way. Need to say that. *(Gives example of development up Havillah Road – commented on that long ago)*. Eventually we *(the county)* get pressure to make improvements, even when it is not in the transportation plan or maintenance plan. Make it so it is not a public road until the improvements and infrastructure are in place *(Gives an example around Lake Osoyoos where a sewer line was needed within the road right-of-way)*. The language we need, and need to enforce, is that development needs to pay for its own way – make the needed improvements. Even though the transportation plan is done for us, it doesn’t have everything we need. Need to incorporate what goes into the Comp Plan in the transportation plan.

PH provides an example of unplanned development at Champerty Shores (water, sewer, transportation).

CB – *(More discussion of Champerty Shores)* Sewer lines crossing private property doesn’t work well. Need to have it in the road right-of-way. Need to all agree on the principle that development pays its own way. County paying for it is unsustainable. Need to agree on principle, unless you *(JT)* have a better idea.

BR – It is the ‘onesies’ and ‘twosies’ that are under the radar *(2 pm JD arrives)*. How big a subdivision will that apply to?

CB – I am a full supporter of property rights, but we need to make sure that making more property owners *(through subdivision)*, we have to make sure that all those owners can fully exercise those property rights.

PH – City expansion areas will require additional planning. Comp Plan is currently under review. We will make changes the commissioners choose. The rest of it, we can salt it around. *(Discusses ‘farming out’ some planning to consulting firms. Is not generally in favor; prefers it be done by those with local knowledge)*

JT – Through the RTPO *(Washington Dept. Transportation’s Regional Transportation Planning Organization)* we get about \$78,000 for planning. I am writing an RFP *(Request for Proposals from consultants)*. The money we have now needs to be spent by June. RTPO wants to focus on the primitive road study. I would prefer to consider all unpaved road. Where is development going? Where do we need to pave? Could possibly do it through the Planning Department – local knowledge.

CB – I like to go in-house, as long as we have the capacity. The upside of having a firm do it *(not arguing for it)* – we can say, this is what we want and expect. You still would have staff providing the information. Could do it using both Planning and Public Works departments.

PH – Problem with the two-headed dragon. Problem with capacity is that you could have a firm do it, but still not have the capacity to implement.

CB – (*refers to the 'Miracle Mile' – good plan done by firm, but no capacity to implement*).

JT – Talking about Public Works (PW) doing a desk exercise (*GIS*). Have been cautioned about having it become politicized.

AH – In my mind, PW is just the science end – 'This is what would, topographically, be the best.' Then you (*Planning*) could take over and do the rest.

PH – (*agrees*) For instance, if you put your transportation grid where there is no water, it is not going to work. For the most part we could get a little bit ahead of that.

CB – I keep going back to the East Lake deal. There is a company that wants to do a big, for Okanogan County, development. Some people are falling all over themselves. We need to put it right up front – you need to put in a sewer system. What is it going to cost? A couple million dollars? They need to put that up, or the county will end up paying for it. What is it going to end up costing to maintain all the roads? You need to identify where it will cost a lot to maintain road system.

PH – Need to be mindful of national insurance costs (*re. wildfire*). We've seen it with FEMA. They want to get out of the disaster business. With insurance companies being reluctant to insure and FEMA. Transportation infrastructure will be one of the things they will be looking at.

CB – We have to be able to explain that. We have to explain in regards to affordable housing stock. People are already arguing that (*charging developers for needed infrastructure will increase housing costs*).

PH – So, we can wait and see what shakes out of the Comp Plan, or would you like to get a proposal from PW on how to move forward?

AH – (*too rapid to record*)

CB – If I was with the RTPO, I would (*inaudible*) I think it would be a message to those who want to challenge our plan. It is just that groundwork.

PH – The circulation of the Comp Plan. It came out of the 2014 Comp Plan. Bob Brashears pulled out the circulation part – it relies on a map.

CB – Are you talking about the element (*inaudible*)?

PH – There was a huge transportation plan developed – I think it was in the 90's – Brashears took that plan, boiled it down to a circulation element, and that was what went in to the Comp Plan. Is that what I envision as a section? We have salted around other discussion of transportation. Could put all that work together in one section.

CB – Maps that lay out the transportation plan, those can be incorporated. But you have to tie those together with the principles behind the plan.

PH – Another category of road I want to add to the list are the agency roads. The county has in the past allowed development along those roads. Now the Forest Service is asking us to take over certain roads. To a point, they have a point.

CB – Primitive road study needs to include those. We need to do something about it. Having that information is going to be key. Need to get ahead of problems.

BR – I think there are a lot of policy discussions that are needed. Consistency is important so that we are not guessing (*about development*) each time. So we are not putting that burden on Perry's shoulders every time.

JT – Two concerns, in terms of cost. Paving. The other is just adding miles – even if the road is upgraded by developers.

CB – If we have to do that – are the property taxes really going to pay for that?

JT – Road fund only goes up 1% a year, regardless of property values. People don't understand that.

BR – (*Referring to Green Lake Road?*) There are a lot of lots up there. A lot of them will be developed...

CB – If there is enough water...

PH – Commissioners – are we directed to come up with a proposal?

JD – (*inaudible question*)

BR – RTPO directed me.

CB – In-house? What do you (*PH*) think about it?

PH – Money will be gone (*if we use a consulting firm*) and we won't know a lot more than we do now. You will get a prettier packaging of the information we give them.

CB – That is why I am asking. Will RTPO trust that we will get it done?

JT – If we go in and tell them how we will do it, I think they will.

CB – You have got a lot going on.

PH – We would have to have some discussion of how we can tag team.

JT – We will get \$30,000 a year. Need discussions of how that could be used.

CB – Towns can help.

BR – RTPO wants to focus on towns that are on state highways. Is that part of the same package?

JT – We would need a separate RFP.

CB – Eventually the highways will become intolerable... Towns opposed it.

PH – Commissioners want us to work on a proposal?

AH – I do. Eventually we need to move into the 21st century and start planning where things are going to go.

(inaudible discussion of some problem spot. Winthrop bridge?)

AH – They did Twisp’s bridge, 20, 25 years ago?

JT – 20.

AH – They had Eastside Road for a bypass. I want to go into Executive section (*real estate purchase*) for 10 minutes.

(2:45 BR leaves. The rest go in to executive session)

3:00 Commissioners return to regular section

Mapping Project

PH – Sent you an email last week. They want to schedule a webinar

??? AH and CB are unfamiliar with the subject.

PH – Years ago we were talking about high resolution mapping (*LIDAR imagery*). Finally they got funding. Email was vague about the webinar. Can set this up if the commissioners are in favor. Started under the previous board.

CB – I think we should (*AH agrees*)

PH – Okay. I will set that up.

WRIA 49 Watershed Plan Update

PH – Scott (?) is setting up a scoring matrix for the responses to the RFP. Participating governments are stepping up. I think we need to agree on the broad strokes picture of what we need for a facilitator.

CB – Need to talk to Todd. He was saying that he would like to see one of us from the initiating governments be designated as decision-makers. *Note: initiating governments have representatives on the Planning Unit. CB is the representative of BOCC.*

PH – Yes. I think we are getting to where there is concern about whether this is moving fast enough. Would like some discussion of how initiating governments make the routine, day-to-day decisions. For the RFP (*Request for Proposals from consultants for facilitation services*), the planning unit has been directed to make a recommendation, then initiating governments make decision. He wants to discuss.

CB – My sense is that one outfit is going to be favored – and I will support it – the one that has the trust of the broad group involved. The Conservation District (CD) spends a lot of energy making sure they don’t break the trust of the cooperators (*farmers and ranchers*). I think a lot of the group won’t want the Washington Water Trust. I can’t remember how we landed on the CD (*who facilitated the previous WRIA 49 watershed plan*), but we did.

PH – My understanding is that the initiating governments submit the update to the government (*Washington Dept. of Ecology*). Todd is asking whether the Planning Unit makes the decisions about how they are going to operate, or is it the initiating governments? My suggestion is that the Planning Unit decides. (*Discusses various ‘housekeeping’ decisions that will be coming up – information needs, hydrologist support, etc.*). Observations? Do you believe that the Planning Unit (*sub-committee*) should come back and get buy-in from the initiating governments when making routine decisions?

AH – I don't think so.

CB – *(inaudible)*

AH – I would like to see consistency.

CB – Perry, are you going to be attending the meetings?

PH – As a resource, yes.

AH – Here is a question for you. You said you wanted to use Aspect (*Consulting*).

PH – I said, 'as an example'.

AH – Are the Planning Unit bound by the same rules that we are?

PH – You would be putting out the RFP. Some would say that slows things down. You could put out a RFQ (*Request for Qualifications*).

CB – We have to be careful about conflicts.

PH – If you are willing to make a straight line to the RFQ... The planning unit wants help, technical assistance, to identify consumptive use. I can bring that back to you, to start the process.

AH – With qualifications, you put out the amount of money you need to spend. Where does that amount of money come from? We transmit the RFQ, and choose the best qualified. Who decides the budget amount?

PH – We have a preliminary budget.

AH – So, that is already set?

PH – We have some latitude.

AH – I don't know why we would need to be a checkpoint. You have enough diversity in the group to make a choice.

CB – You also have the nonvoting members for technical advice.

PH – One way to approach it, to resolve some pre-disposition. If the Planning Unit wants something to be done, the initiating government might to say 'Whoa, whoa, you can't do that!'

CB – *(Inaudible, describes an issue.)*

AH – *(to JD)* Do you think there is enough diversity on there so they don't need to do that?

JD – *(inaudible)*

CB – I think the group is pretty darn diverse. I might add that the diversity among the three of us in the initiating governments...

AH – Agree.

PH – So, you are comfortable with the Planning Unit making their own house-keeping decisions?

CB – If something comes up where I strongly disagree, I will be right there. Will keep you informed.

PH – Vanessa (ECY) sent last round of suggestions (*Regarding contract that will provide funding*). Will get those back.

CB – Do you get the sense that if something comes up, that there may be more funding available?

PH – I don't get that sense. I hear repeatedly that the grant is all we've got. Members roster is complete. Pretty much the same you got last time, except Upper Col. Salmon Recover Boards (UCSRB). Anything else?

CB asks AH an inaudible question about the UCSRB.

AH – We are meeting on Friday.

CB – I think it is important for them to understand that we still need their input.

Tunk Watershed Water Availability Study Area (Unscheduled discussion)

CB - About our overlay (*Tunk watershed water availability study*). In many ways it is part of this (*WRIA 49 watershed planning*) (*agreement*). Nothing I heard from anybody was (*credible?*). There was no evidence that anything anybody said...

AH – (*to PH*) How long would it take (*Inaudible. Something about mitigation*)?

PH – Depends. If you want to adopt it as an interim control....

AH – I think if someone splits a 40-acre lot. They want to build a house. They can come in with a mitigation for 700+ gallons per day...

CB – (*Inaudible*)

AH – If I want to hire a hydrogeologist and say I want to do mitigation, how do I do that? I think they should be able to do that.

PH – It is up to your comfort level. You can adopt interim controls. Another option is to amend the code in front of you. You would have to adopt language, send it to the planning commission.

AH – I see what you are saying. (*to CB*) I am in favor of the overlay. But if they can do mitigation...

CB – Moving down the road, we do what we have to do. If we have to do an amendment. The testimony we heard had no merit. If you come in and testify that all the water in the Tunk comes from here, and everybody knows it... I don't know it.

AH – The one that had merit for me was the statement that says, you only have two options. No. When I hear that there are more mitigations out there than you have listed, that rings the gong for me. Purchase of water right of (?) If we are talking about localized water loss... can they purchase water and truck it up there?

CB – (*Inaudible*)

AH – What if I am a landowner and I want to hire a hydrogeologist and do my own study. The YN did that – hired a hydrogeologist.

CB – Does that mean the public can comment on the proposed mitigation.

PH – Keep in mind that this only restricts me from accepting an application for subdivision.

(discussion of subdivision, public review)

AH – Short plat/long plat. All the documents provided to you would be part of the public review?

PH – Yes. To review those sorts of applications, we would have to figure out what would be accepted as mitigation... Are we opening the door to litigation. It would have been incredibly useful if the people who testified would have provided documentation.

CB – When you come in and make a statement about something without real information, that is when I say 'let the corruption begin'.

(Rapid discussion and clarification. AH expresses that 'corruption' implies bribery; CB clarifies that it also includes 'old boy' networks affecting decisions.)

PH – I will bring more information to the next meeting.

Airport Safety Zones – Tonasket Update

PH – I forwarded to you what was published on Wednesday. (*Tonasket*) Planning Commission will likely see it at February meeting.

CB – You said you had maps?

PH – No. I should have said map analysis (steep slope, zoning, etc.) You will see on the environmental checklist the things I included. That is now out for review. I will check with Mr. (Dan__?) what airport he wants to do next. I anticipate some pushback for Oroville. Also maybe Twisp.

Champerty Shores

PH – Mr. Barker reports that his part of the project is completed. Still trying to find out from Champerty Shores if they have the money to do the next part. Until we get the bond money, may not be able to move forward. Might have to talk with you about other options. I don't think it would be more than \$25,000 (temporary loan?). About to put out a RFP.

CB – (inaudible, something about another funding source)

PH – (itemizes all the elements that will be rolled into the bond issue)

CB – Have you had discussions with the Treasurer?

PH – Yes. Her only concern was having a defined method for bond servicing. The rest was nuts and bolts.

WATV District 1

PH – (*Too rapid to record; brief and evidently not substantive*)

4:03 End of meeting.