

BOARD OF OKANOGAN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
02/11/2019

In Attendance at Meeting:

Jim DeTro- JD (BOCC)

Chris Branch – CB (BOCC)

Lanie Johns – LJ (Clerk of the Board)

Perry Huston - PH (Administrator & Planning Director)

Commissioner Andy Hover was absent.

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.

Summary of significant discussions

Capital Facility Plan – Update

PH updated the commissioners on the status of improvements to the Similkameen and Whistler Canyon trails. PH is pursuing potential partnerships. The commissioners will consider forming a Parks and Recreation advisory group.

WRIA 49 Watershed Plan

The planning unit has agreed on operating procedures and have elected a chairman. PH tells the commissioners that the group is ready to move forward. The planning unit favors selecting the Conservation District to provide facilitation; commissioners concur. Individuals representing 4 irrigation districts have been selected to join the group. The commissioners pass a motion approving letters of appointment. PH informs the commissioners that of the first two watershed plans scheduled for completion, one did not meet its deadline and the Washington Department of Ecology (ECY) has begun writing the rules (as specified by ESSB 6091).

Comprehensive Plan

Evidently, a public records request for a large amount of information is requiring a lot of Planning Department staff time. When the response for records is complete, staff will return to organizing the public comments received during the EIS scoping period.

Intergovernmental Agreement

The commissioners passed a resolution approving an inter-governmental agreement with the City of Omak and the Housing Authority regarding an affordable housing project.

Champerty Shores Sewer Extension

There was a brief discussion of options for funding completion of the sewer extension.

Update Planning Department

Capital Facility Plan – Update

PH – I have been meeting with Dennis. He and I worked on draft resolution to send over to you. The item for discussion is trails. Methow is a different beast, because of trails association. In Okanogan we have Whistler and Similkameen trails. Talked with the PUD. They don't want trails. Have some things coming up that we ought to do. Bridge inspection. History: not long after I got here (2008-ish), Similkameen trail had languished, and I was directed to get it moving. Combination of right-of-way (ROW) and construction. Got ROW from BLM and some private landowners. Part of money went to construction – ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compatible – and re-surfaced bridge (*belonging to the PUD*). Now, we have no money for work from PUD to Nighthawk. Bridge is due for inspection. The number I heard ventured – not pinned down – about \$25,000.

JD – Can't Josh do it?

PH – I don't know. Depends what is needed. The culverts need inspection/cleanout. Weed control. Outstanding project – permission from Bureau of Land Management (BLM), but not easements. The PUD is willing to partner with us, but that implies that we are willing to put some money into it. We don't have money in the budget. The banner I have put it under is the Capital Facility Plan (CFP). Whistler Canyon – have a partnership with the Backcountry Horsemen. Re-surfacing parking lot, bathrooms. Haven't heard from them for a while. The original idea was that someone else would own it. The Forest Service (FS) doesn't want it. Talked to BLM – they lowballed the offer and the former commissioners were not interested.

CB asks an inaudible question (about maintenance?).

PH – I would add it to the CFP – it is a major project.

CB – Including weed control?

PH – Not by itself, but as part of bigger project.

CB – Has this been discussed with Parks and Rec.?

PH – Phase 2, we will do just that. Put out an ad, and don't think anyone was interested in serving.

JD (*to CB*) – Reconstitute the Parks and Rec board?

CB – Maybe. Don't know all the implications about that. At least a committee.

PH differentiates between creating a parks and rec district, which would necessitate a board, and just having a committee (advisory?). Discussion of the distinction ensues.

CB – It serves a couple of purposes. One, to qualify for RCO (*Washington Recreation and Conservation Office*) funding. The other is to get local input. It would benefit the north county. We could document the utilization. People going to the visitor center are asking about trails.

PH – It is a potentially valuable facility. (?) is interested in putting together a parks and rec committee. My crew would pick that up, in terms of staffing the county's role.

CB – (to JD). FS has SEPA(?) document. Interested in establishing a road between FS and DNR land for a timber sale. Also interested in establishing a trail. They got some comments from loggers on plan to decommission roads in sale. Conservation NW were aware (*inaudible*). I think they (FS) have a preferred alternative. If we have conversations with them as this unfolds, maybe they will be interested in partnering on the trail.

PH – They couldn't come up with the money fast enough to make this thing part of the sale.

JD – (*inaudible*)

PH – (*Inaudible*) We ended up with just the parking lot. We did discuss (*inaudible*). If I am tracking with our conversation, I would dredge up our resolution to create a Parks and Rec board (*countywide*).

JD – At one time, it was in conjunction with the Fairgrounds.

PH – We brought them back. (*Discusses the history with the Fairgrounds Advisory Committee. Parks and Rec district failed at ballot box*). You can form an advisory board. Will look at old resolution and prepare options for you.

CB – The PUD, though, needs the road.

PH – Yes. Even without the electrification. They recognize it. Their attorney is most interested in getting the easement worked out.

CB – It is a good opportunity for a partnership that could be effective.

PH – Will come up with options for you to consider.

CB asks about timeline.

PH – Envision a project with a 6-year funding. Year one – design. Year 4 – construction. Projected activity for Year 2. I will work on that.

WRIA 49 Watershed Plan

WRIA 49. Very productive meeting. Agreed on operating procedures. Elected a chairman. Are ready to move ahead. Have identified a couple of options for a phone system - \$500. The grant will reimburse us. Webinar, call-in option.

CB – We need to do that. It will work for other things.

PH – We need it for a lot of things.

CB – The decision I didn't feel good about – they didn't allow the call-ins to actually participate. Don't know how the other initiating governments feel about it.

PH – Mixed bag. (*Discussion of motivations. Then about details of phone-in equipment, webinar capabilities; PH thinks the proposed phone system will help with allowing remote participation.*)

Planning Unit recommended Conservation District be hired as facilitator. Other initiating governments

are comfortable. Are you commissioners comfortable? (Yes). Want to get going with contract. George Thornton was elected chairman. He is an alternate, not a voting member. We are well on our way. ECY people will probably make a presentation (*in May?*). I gave Lanie a letter for 3 members. Craig Vejraska (*sp.?*) One problem is (*inaudible*). We have 4 people who volunteered to serve – representing irrigation districts (*describes their locations*). Are you comfortable with that? (11 irrigation districts)

CB expresses that water rights holders are well represented.

JD – They are welcome to attend.

PH – We have people from scattered around. Post-meeting discussion – other initiating governments seemed comfortable with those 4 representing the irrigation districts if you are okay with it.

CB – My understanding is that the rules that require that you have attended previous meeting doesn't stand yet?

PH – My theory is that we are starting with a clean slate, starting from now.

CB – (*moves to approve sending the 4 letters; JD seconds; motion passes*)

PH discusses some details of budgeting. CB raises questions about WRIA's with Feb. 2019 deadlines for plans. WRIA 1 did not meet deadline; ECY has begun writing rules. The next deadline is Feb. 2020.

CB – That was an interesting thing for everyone for hear.

PH - ECY is moving with some speed.

JD – Constance (?) with ECY, in my first term, came in with a stack about that (*3 ft*) high. Told us that we should adopt it.

CB – You have to be realistic about it because they have the option to say 'This doesn't meet the law.'. So do the initiating governments, don't they? (*yes*)

Comprehensive Plan

Don't have too much to update you on. Putting together facts and figures. Public records request is bigger than I had thought. Working on that, then will get back to tables. We are organizing the comments.

Intergovernmental Agreement

PH – Other two entities have already signed (Affordable Housing project) – City of Omak & Housing Authority. It is a permitted use in your zone. The city has more stringent requirements for a planned development, so they will provide oversight.

CB – As I recall, the property that is in the county is part of a shift of the project boundaries.

PH – There were some issues. I would prefer that they work it out.

CB moves to approve resolution; JD seconds; resolution approved.

Champerty Shores Sewer Extension

PH – Still trying to get the committee to (?) Need professional services.

CB – I imagine they have discussed the implications of doing it the government way.

PH – They don't have the money. Looking at a governmental bond issue.

CB asks a question about how they installed the water line.

CB – Not sure they understand that this will be more expensive....

PH – They don't have another way...

Discussion of benefits of the project; CB points out the development is right down to where pipes will be in water table; asks about gravity delivery vs. pressurized. PH gives details. PH describes projecting future development to allow further extension. Discussion of what has gone wrong elsewhere & lessons learned.

2:50 Meeting ends.