

BOARD OF OKANOGAN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
1/28/2019

Present:

Jim DeTro - JD, BOCC
Andy Hover - AH, BOCC
Chris Branch - CB, BOCC
Lanie Johns - LJ, BOCC
Josh Thomson - JT, County Engineer
Dave Hilton - DH, Environmental Health, Okanogan County

These notes have been taken by one of several volunteer citizen note takers and published on the web-site 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.

SUMMARY:

County Water Availability Study Areas & Amendment to 17.400.120. Extended speculation on possible mitigations that could both preserve senior water rights and allow subdivision while eliminating impact of exempt wells upon instream flows. WRIA 48 - recent reversal of WDOE procedures in closed basins; how county is currently answering public questions re water situation; Hover pushes to move ahead on certain mitigations; site analyses & vesting; surveyor questions re closed basins; Long-term planning, Primitive Roads analysis (to be under Huston), Public works staffing; Transportation Plan /Circulation Element; WRIA 49 Update; Limiting Factors/Population growth; Tonasket Hospital Emergency & county marketing, economics, & CERB Board.

1:30 - Continued Public Hearing: Overlays, Water Availability Study Areas OCC 17A. 400.130-deliberation (Record was left open for written comments.)

Review Ordinance amending OCC 17A.400.130

PH - You are here to consider the amendments (*discussed at last BOCC hearing.*) We left off - a discussion of ordinance itself, and attached whether other exemptions should be included. I have another couple of possible amendments.

Starting with ordinance: One change pointed out by BOCC in re surface water, there may be wells....I suggest we remove "surface" from ordinance and use just term "water."

How to approach mitigations: Simply include that as part of the Scope of Work of water availability areas. (Reads text rapidly.) If you adopt this language, it becomes part of the scope of work.

As the study goes on, there may be other sorts of enabling actions. You may need to remove "density." You can accomplish some of these measures within this language. This approach would be "folded into" the scope of work.

Review memorandum re OCC 17A.400.120 - Perry Huston

Re the memo generated: takes another approach. Has the language listing the 5 exemptions for which we can do a land division proposal. We have drafted OCC 17A.400.120 (*reads rapidly.*) Regarding divisions made where potable water supplies will be provided by permit exempt wells, additional water meter, water to be transported to an on-site injection well...etc.

Exceptions (From projection later in meeting)

1. *Public parcel segregations for which no potable water supply is required.*
2. *Divisions made by testamentary provisions, or the laws of descent in accordance with RCW 58.17.040*
3. *Divisions made for purposes of separating land on which a residential structure currently exists to allow the recording of covenants, conditions, and restrictions or a conservation easement which prevents the construction of new residence on the parcel created through the land division process.*
4. *Divisions made where potable water supplies will be provided by a water right approved for such purposes by the DOE, or by purchase of credits from an approved water bank.*
5. *Divisions made where potable water supplies will provided by an approved water purveyor or municipal system.*

Followed by these options:

- 1) Route through Planning Commission, leaving language in place
- 2) Or can "fold" into Water Availability Study Area.

Your Action to Amend .130 (Adopted Water Availability Study Areas) - Would put the areas in question into the code. No interim controls then. You would be in the 2-year "window."

(Taken from projection later in the meeting: "The type of mitigation measures, if found to be necessary, that would meet the objectives of protecting the rights of senior water rights holders to obtain the water to which they are legally entitled and eliminate the impact of new permit exempt wells on meeting the instream flow appropriation.")

How do you wish to proceed?

Discussion of Mitigations

JD - Opens up to Board.

AH - Doesn't like it that someone who wants to subdivide their property is at the whims of gov't and watershed council. So we have a lot of varying opinions on the amount of water available, both ends of spectrum. But we have to do SOMETHING up there to figure out what is actually available. The mitigation....I want to be sure we are doing the technical portion of the mitigation. If we were saying just meter this and meter that, put the water back.... and that's the mitigation - there is no double-check as to whether science is sound. I believe that we need to do something up here but also give an opportunity to mitigate. I think we are getting close to that with this.

We have same issue in the Methow where 1100 people can't build. We need to figure out if there are mitigations....

JD - *inaudible comment*

AH - Hard - you can't just pick and choose what you want to do. You can't pick and choose among "them." I think what we need to do is put on the overlay; we have some language about mitigation for the overlay section, and start looking immediately about what kind of mitigations we can do as far as recharge goes. Trying not to go too fast, but we need to do something so people can split their lots, etc.

CB - We are just now getting into the process about how mitigation takes place, but in the short term we are now getting into something that creates mitigations before we get there. In subdivision (*inaudible*) that might be a simple thing. And what kind of uses are being allowed. Right now ...even ecology now is looking at the basin and looking at water usage in the whole situation right now.

AH - My problem is that there are mitigations out there that are already being employed that are accepted by DOE as valid mitigation measures. I don't want to wait until 2021 on something that is recognized by DOE now.

CB - Asks to project some of the language. Projects the suggested language to OCC 17A 400.120.

Exceptions (Same as above)

1. *Public parcel segregations for which no potable water supply is required.*
2. *Divisions made by testamentary provisions, or the laws of descent in accordance with RCW 58.17.040*
3. *Divisions made for purposes of separating land on which a residential structure currently exists to allow the recording of covenants, conditions, and restrictions or a conservation easement which prevents the construction of new residence on the parcel created through the land division process.*
4. *Divisions made where potable water supplies will be provided by a water right approved for such purposes by the DOE, or by purchase of credits from an approved water bank.*
5. *Divisions made where potable water supplies will provided by an approved water purveyor or municipal system.*

CB - Ecology is doing work right now to evaluate water availability....

PH - There has been some other discussion initiated because landowners approached consultants. Don't know what will apply. (*hard to follow.*)

AH - This verbiage - I don't agree with right here. We need to tweak it. I want to present the idea can someone purchase water outside the basin and decrease the amount of water they use. What is the science behind it? Is it meter in and meter out? Conditional use permit on house? Do you have to show yearly receipts for amount of water you purchased to replace the water you used?

JD - *inaudible comment*

AH - Probably through us. (?)

AH - Not saying this text is the silver bullet. I want to not wait until 2021 in keeping people from doing something - because there are mitigation measures they can do.

CB - There needs to be something about what is actually being proposed. Right now, DOE is looking at it, there are other things like assessing senior water rights. What I don't want to see: that we have an exception within the rule that someone is going to come along and take advantage of,....and senior water rights are impaired.

PH - If you adopt the ordinance with even this amendment language, it does not change "120" :What it would do if you adopt as proposed, is fold a study of mitigation measures into the Water Availability study. These 5 are the only ones I can accept.

Change in Ordinance Itself

The only addition to the ordinance is to strike out "surface" water and the addition of #4, addition of "types of mitigation measures, if found to be necessary to protect the rights of senior water right holders to obtain the water to which they are legally entitled and eliminate the impact of new permit exempt wells on meeting the in-stream flow appropriation. "

CB - in re the exemptions - Subdivisions - no application for the subdivision of property located within an overlay zone will be accepted, except for:

(Typed from projection) Exemptions (SAME AS ABOVE)

- 1. Public parcel segregations for which no potable water supply is required.*
- 2. Divisions made by testamentary provisions, or the laws of descent in accordance with RCW 58.17.040*
- 3. Divisions made for purposes of separating land on which a residential structure currently exists to allow the recording of covenants, conditions, and restrictions or a conservation easement which prevents the construction of new residence on the parcel created through the land division process.*
- 4. Divisions made where potable water supplies will be provided by a water right approved for such purposes by the DOE, or by purchase of credits from an approved water bank.*
- 5. Divisions made where potable water supplies will provided by an approved water purveyor or municipal system.*

Discussion of what can be done to allow subdivisions in parcels that have already been purchased.....

CB - The background is that for every lot we create, we also have that expectation. Then we add one (?) to the whole system. Right now, you can get an exempt well.

AH - On every lot now, there, you can drill a well.

AH - Right now, we are not taking away anyone's property rights who currently owns a lot. It just takes away the ability to make more lots.

Current process

CB - to PH - Say you get an application for a short plat right now. What do you do?

PH - I would weigh the application for the Short Plat..... I would weigh it against these 5 exemptions. If doesn't meet one, they do not subdivide. I would lay the application against the 5 exemptions. What would be different is that ...*(inaudible!)*

CB - to PH : So in that evaluation, unless it meets one of these 5, you will not even accept the application.

CB - Asks AH - you didn't like that language ? *(in #6 - not projected copy now.)*

AH - Because DOE says they have scientific work that says only 10% of the water is consumptive. If I run 10 gallons through my sprinkler, I have to replace 8 gallons. This language doesn't make distinction between indoor and outdoors....*goes on with examples of amount of irrigation vs indoors* - this requires more differentiation than what is here.

CB - I was looking for an answer as to what change to make that would allow for this mitigation on a unique basis that would allow a subdivision to occur.

AH - Not a change to ordinance...to make it say that somehow we are able to push forward. we will need it on both WRIA 48 & 49 in the future. This language doesn't really

AH - Go back to 130.: "The type of mitigation measures, if found to be necessary, that would meet the objectives of protecting the rights of senior water rights holders to obtain the water to which they are legally entitled and eliminate the impact of new permit exempt wells on meeting the instream flow appropriation."

AH - to PH: How would this be "folded in?"

PH - All info would go into the "fold" (? *difficult to hear.*) If the study reveals.....If you look at study and say we will have our hands full just preserving what we've got.....it would *(inaudible.)* As people come in and propose mitigation measures, that would not be a part of the evaluation of an application. It would be information in order to inform the study. Not a part of the application. Separate what mitigation would be on a property vs the study of mitigations.

AH - There are a whole bunch of lots there. If we allow people to subdivide and we find out that there is an issue, we have taken away the ability of the people who already own lots to build on their lots. Creates more problems. So I would..... based on this info, I would hope that we start looking at water mitigations as soon as we possibly can. Getting DOE onboard as to what we are doing with mitigations.

To PH: the motion for this would be ???

PH - If you wish to move ahead with this ordinance, you would scratch "surface" and add section 4. This does not change the language of 120. This does not implement section 6 *(which must have been taken out.)*

AH We need to start asking questions of DOE. Don't know if that's in 120, or we just start pressing on.

PH - You are amending the scope of work in the ordinance itself.

JD - Striking “surface” from 1 and 2, and adding section 4.

AH - Present as motion.

JD - Discussion?” *(No one offers further discussion.)*

JD and AH - vote yes.

CB - “You have mine.” *(Not certain as to whether or not he voted for it.)*

Motion amending OCC 17A.400.130 has passed. (Striking “surface” from 1 and 2, and adding section 4.)

Miscellaneous discussion on various aspects: *(Difficult to follow.)*

JD - If we start working on memo language *Brings up water quality when putting water back into cistern.*

JD - Addresses Dave Hilton about this

AH - Working with public health , DOEwe need to push forward. I know it’s being done.

CB - Interesting that they set 5,000 gal per day. They set it...with the assumption that there is a septic system....

AH - Think about it....you are never pulling out 5,000 gallons.....

CB - We had same discussions in Oroville - we are actually returning the water to the river, right?? The thing was that the water was altered.

AH - I have read technical documents on recharge.

CB - 5,000 was a kit if water,,there has to have been connected a requirement to meter the use.

PH - What you are talking about doesn’t say anything about quality...just a permit to draw.

CB - The point is, why was it set at 5,000/day?

PH - *Talks about how quantity does not address quality.* Class A needs a water right - we will be having that discussion in the distant future.

AH - I want to say that weI think we need to protect as many people as we can.

JD - It’s long-term.

PH - I lost the connection - do you want to adopt?

Answer: With the changes, yes.

2) WRIA 48

Closed basins-Change in WDOE policy; How Planning is answering public's questions; Site Analyses; Vesting; Survey questions.

In restricted areas, WDOE: wells inside the restricted areas but not put to use - even with bedrock letter - were not going to stand. This no longer seems to be the case. They seem to be recognizing those letters now. At one point, it was only if there was a house. Not so now.

In the areas that have not been reviewed, DOE is reluctant to make the decision yet.

What I have done, because of issues that have come up in the last week or so, when someone calls if they are in 48, they want to know.....question comes in many ways.....can I build a house, can I drill a well, etc. I try to interview to see what the situation is. Are they a landowner? A developer?

Have instructed them to do is take that information and create a map. Sometimes they are out of restricted areas, etc. Shows example in French Ck on projector - the parcel is apparently partly in McFarland Ck, partly in French creek. In proximity to French Creek and Methow River. Huston - this is one where I would not be comfortable in making the call. DOE has not made French Cr. boundaries. They would not be told yes or no *by county*.

AH - My definition of customer service is that the customer knows what is going on. Right now, we can't decide right off the bat....we will confer with DOE and get back with you.

PH - Who they speak to (at WDOE) may matter. I will double-check. In old Title 20 days, we'd use this as an application. At this point, it is essentially informational unless they apply for building permit, etc. In WA, without a complete application they are not vested. Then they want to know what they can do.....

AH - The words "site analysis." What if you do an analysis for them?

PH - it costs \$90.

AH - Asks Dave Hilton - by site analysis

Hilton - it's a site evaluation...(then there is building permit by Planning)

PH - My site analysis is only good for one year. But they might not want to build in 5 years. The best scenario is if they want to do something now. If they apply now, they are vested.

Gives examples of certain details that could be dealt with now, vs needing to wait to apply.

AH - At what level are we going to.... say, I'll look and say it's outside a closed basin - I need to take 3-4 hours out of the day to do this....

PH - We do "informationary" site analysis. If asked to do more, I will do it.

CB - When you talk about vesting, it's little straightforward if out of restricted area...but if marked, it's nothing like the vesting we've had in days past more that you can invest in the existing rules as soon as we figure out what they are.

PH - In this example - could the French Ck area pull out further down along the stream? This is one where the French Cr restricted has been changed. In some cases, pulled back, in others not.

AH - So when they closed these, they were talking water rights. Describes dilemmas in understanding the whole thing-such as was adjudication done long ago?

CB - A lot going on. A lot of change taking place. Change in use of land. May benefit flows, may not. the other thing we need to get a handle on....those areas that were just changed from minimum requirement district - you look at what you can do on a new lot...those dynamics are really important. The Methow 2 cfs is.....*interrupted*...

CURRENT PROCEDURE IN ANSWERING CALLS FROM PUBLIC

PH - So this is what we are doing if someone comes in. We take a lot of calls - 2,3,4,5 a day, some from landowner, perspective purchaser, developer.

AH - Cow Ck? Is it pretty definitive that you are either in or out?

PH - Most of the time.

SURVEYOR QUESTIONS

AH - From surveyors, I get the question - how thick is that line? Project one of the shape models. 6" line? lines go through parcels.

Pulls up a map, points at one square parcel. How thick is the line around it? If you give GPS coordinates...if you are within 1 foot of the line....

AH - Let's review this Alder Ck parcel - tell them to keep their well in bottom of the parcel so it's out of the restricted area.

CB - Is there a piece of topography that might determine where it drains? If there were that kind of a divide, I think there are many circumstances about whether there is a well on either side.....

AH - What if parcel is flat?

CB - That's why I wonder why..... *interrupted*

AH - Little Wolf Ck is flat.....Interesting. Flat? back water flow?

PH - Just last week, we walked through a parcel... pulled up... there was a restricted area...on the phone, walked through where the landmarks were on the parcel. Do it case by case. Just wanted you to know how we are dealing with these calls.

PH - Uses French Ck analysis: Something like this - I can't tell you what it will be in 5 years. (to owner.)

Long Term Planning/Public Works Staffing - Primitive Roads Analysis - Josh Thomson, Perry Huston

PH- We talked about primitive roads analysis. On different occasions, discussions on staffing and how much needed to do this work, We were sent off to work something out. I think Josh and I ...in terms of bringing in consultant, we are not convinced it's the best way to go. Money an issue, and does not give opportunity to work that analysis into the regs. Talked about other long-range planning projects. We got a 1 -year extension to end of 2019 to do CAO. (from Commerce.)

Talking to Josh: we could situate this in Planning. Where it tends to be politically charged- we already do that - so we don't need to run it through public works. I don't think we could cobble together enough grants to fully fund a position . Could come close. We talked about planning \$\$ for the RTPO. What I envision is a Planner 2 grade, dedicated to long-range planning. Getting them involved with project planning, to justify the position, but mostly they would be doing Primitive Roads analysis, assisting with WRIA 49, skill set - experience in math, but don't need ...(??.?) Use that position in a dedicated manner to catch up some of this stuff. We talked about an Assistant Director - not sure that is money well spent.....Senior planner is more supervisory. That's what is in my mind as a way to make this work.

PH - Question - What do you want to do -funding for Josh and then can search to fill position? What do the Commissioners envision?

JT - The Planning funding through RTPO - about \$35-40,000 to spend on this by the end of June, then another round of funding, depending upon how OCOG wants to spend, could flesh out (???) RTPO another \$35-40,000 til end of the year. Insured of putting out an RFQ, hiring someone in-house would be possible.

CB - How would OCOG look at it? I would be concerned about hiring a Planner and getting this lost in.....(*interrupted*)

PH Understood - Primitive roads are relevant to all this. What I envision is not only that level of review but targeting that according to where people are building, how much public/private land, conservation lots, etc. Ties buildable lands analyst to primitive roads. Putting people on a road that will not handle it - fire issues come in, and we haven't necessarily done that....

CB - So this is a part of the function of the study...when you do look at where subdivisions could happen.....what is included in the development to support a road system towards a road that needs to be maintained and costs the taxpayer...that may include saying that some of these primitive roads may not continue to be primitive roads.

Other long-term issues - long-term planning

PH - **What city expansion areas?**Where? Interface the city streets? etc. So we can get a handle on targeting rest urges we have, but some pre-zoning. Whoever is developing would have to in-

sert the info into the process. The bottom line - the more of these things are worked into the equation up-front, the less work someone will need to do later.

AH - Had a long conversation about **broad band** the other day. Too bad it wasn't treated as a utility way back. So when we are talking about long-range planning efforts, are these things we can tie in right now? Where should utilities go? etc/ - better planning.

PH - If you believe that **broad band access is an important component of economic development strategy**, or whether it is not, this should be a part of your Comp Plan. That should tie probably to your existing... things where they need to be. ...If you have a plan, you can do things like cost sharing, etc...if you have a plan.

CB - In Wenatchee -doing a survey of customer base and talking about how these things were done in the past. **Until now, we have been actually responding to the demand. Asking the rate payers, and they are saying they'd like you to get more ahead of it.** An example - I replied to someone in Chelan County - where they built that whole hillside where you can see the lake... 1 .3 million \$\$.....later on they found the power need they had to the west, then decided to put these huge power lines right across in front of these multi-million dollar houses. Huge impact. Huge fights. It's an example of something where you could stay a little ahead, like 15-20 years, where the county will establish land use set in the future.

JD - Used to be there wasn't enough pre-planning - ie. completely re-pave Hwy 97 in Okanogan and in a few months tear it all up for sewage lines.

AH - Could we do some budget planning ahead for this position? Where power should come in ...where roads would come in.

JT - need to get it on the agenda next week, then discuss the next week we need a fairly good commitment that we can hire and get the work done by the targeted time.

CB - We are now doing long-term over the permitting dept.

AH - I would support saying that we need to know why the budget looks like. position full-time? Will it stop after 3 year?

PH - Numbers should be simple. We have some idea of potential \$\$ through the RTPO. I will call Commerce to get some idea of potential funding sources...

AH - Would you give us Step 1 and Step 4 to the budget? (Talking experience levels.) Don't need for 5 grades. Entry and Step 4 is what I'd like.

PH - We can do that.

CB - Think about what we have talked about - any one of the towns....might be able to offset some costs? In re city expansion areas?

JD - talks about software his brother Scott has. If use this material, brings cut way down. Scott said either a donation or very cheap. He and JT talk about details. Relates to Levy District. JT asks if he could sign cooperative agreement and have Gecas do the right-of-way. (*Do not follow.*) Talks about concerns on a particular project that he and JT know about.

According to Agenda, these are relevant topics: Level of Service Classifications/Capacity County Roads, Agency Roads, Private Roads, Large lot/Exempt Segregations Road requirements, Primitive Road Analysis

Capital Facility Planning - Trying to get memo out this week. Before I send letters to cities, want BOCC suggestions.

Transportation Plan/Circulation Element - All things on primitive roads relate to this. Circulation element is what is required. Not exactly a transportation plan. We have optional and amplified possibilities. Some areas might not be required, but we can amplify or add, and I recommend that we do so, in order to reach issues that have been raised. Looked at expense regs in relation to roads - we need some kind of disclaimer that county not responsible for roads. Need to finish my research.

AH - I can take 500 acres and divide into 25- 20 A lots and not tell you where one road is going to be.

PH - They generally say the roads "are where they are." Could be 2-track, 5-track. sometimes the person on that parcel doesn't want the road. They wind up in litigation and I can give them no help.

CB - Eventually the the road turns into a road that's being used..... it turns into a total mess. Gives examples. DeTro gives example also of a guy that just said NO to a person's need to cross. After he gave an easement, he sold the strip of easement to Dept of Game - but it wasn't his.

PH - Some of the large lots come out ok. but I will bring that back on the primitive road analysis.

PH - Comp Plan Comments - excluding no input at this point

(Re Comp Plan comments) Before end of day, you will have more influx. We had some come in after the deadline. anything that comes in I will give to you. Not excluding anything. I am beginning to break these out into the other subjects around which we will write EIS.

5) WRIA 49 Watershed Plan Update

*Request for Qualifications-update (Omak Assistance)

*Planning Unit Members Roster (OTID Assistance) Sub unit has met regarding procedures of original group. Will be up next week.

*Vanessa (WD)E - should be on road to getting funding on track.

*PUD rep has changed.

*JD - did you get get back on the ??? (*Unintelligible*)

PH - lists some names of members off unit.

CB - Question about Todd Mc Daniels?

PH - Asked if that was going forward. He sent it back. Something about Initiating gov'ts call.

CB - Week is pretty full.

PH - Concerns: speed. An impression that things are not moving quickly. we actually made substantial progress last week. Will report out on conference call.

6) Mapping Project Webinar - NO map yet.

Admin agenda: PH

Lake mangle't site: noxious week board has signed. Sent over final draft of intergovernmental agreement for Omak and Housing authority. Will send to Lanie. Dave looked at it , made minor changes. Do not have it for you to sign yet.

Nothing on **Capital facilities**.

Champerty Shores - Need to talk with (Bulmer?) Association to see if they are going to contribute to PSA &E for their part of the extension. Need to "reverse engine" levy for district.

CB - on the Association? Are you speaking with Mr. Lawrence?

PH - Feedback is that they are in. Not in any official capacity. Will try to get something.

CB - has chair been responsive?

PH - NO, they don't really agree that we need a meeting. Have been trying to go through chairman.

CB - If not, I can call him.

Chit-chat that is hard to follow.

CALENDAR

WATV's - District 1 proposal - public hearing Feb 25.

AH - Feb 11 Will not be here .

PH - Anything for me?

CB - Did you listen to the **webinar** last Friday?

PH - **Yes. Every Friday at 8:30. Jewel of WSAC does an update for land use planners. BOCC certainly welcome to join us.**

PH - mentions streamlining bills. Something in carbon footprinting. Some requirements - being charged to port districts in re increased carb emissions in coal basins. Concerned they will have to assess the enviro impacts of coal at its destination. They are trying to drop registration that constricts. My position is that the port doesn't have to do all this, but we are in no way accountable for impacts if we do. For me, an exponential increase in what we do. There are some things that are relevant.

One more thing: Planning , WRIA 49

Phone call-in option doesn't work well now. My crew exploring whether options exist to manage it better. Could employ in other settings. Could probably pay for through that.

AH .CB — Our system doesn't work very well.

Chatter about cost.

AH - describes some mics. ph - other options of types. Difficulties of people talking over others. If everyone can hear is the big issue.

Huston leaves

Conversations re mitigation: cisterns, use of water for recharge, injections, hydraulic overload, infiltration gallery, “bio-swap,” rainwater collection, Culigan water source etc.

AH - to Dave Hilton (Environmental Health) ...any thoughts or ideas? Asks DH to come and sit.

Asks DeTRo if we can add to agenda (talk with Dave.)

JD - Yes.

AH to DH - Did you look into siting cisterns?

DH - Yes, But nothing definitive. A common sense approach - how long should they have water on hand so it doesn't go stale? What is predictable amt of time? *He says at least a once a week rotation.*

AH - I got a strange look from people when I talked about this.

DH - You can treat water. If you can deal with taste, etc. They might be able to send some of it for gray water.(?) Different routes to take. Realistically, they have to realize the climate is a big factor in determining water availability. They can't just go down the road.

AH - Using water for recharge - I heard you can just dump it down your toilet. Or you could create a separate s system for infiltration. Slower dispersion - or some sort of injection well. So just

from a health perspective - is a shallow well - funny, because it's all there, not necessarily science...ie: does the water for the creek really go through the crack?

DH - How much time does it get from there to there?

AH - But in the closed tributaries, we are talking about the closed surface water. They are concerned about the water that would get to the surface water. ...So close surface infusion is better, because it hasn't gone as deep.

DH - First thing - who is the source. number one issue. After that, which is better (septic system) hydraulically overloading a system - do not want to do that. Option 2 is good - simple infiltration gallery.

JD - "bioswap."

DH - probably the gallery is easier and least costly.

AH - It added a ton of sense when the person who wrote the question - you are actually only mitigating for the used water. 200 of every 1,000 gallons. For indoor use. If you are in closed basin and water is for indoor use only...the reality of our situation now you are doing 10% through the meter. The issue - how do you monitor this? How do you keep track of whether someone is actually purchasing water....etc.

AH - People buy Culligan water all the time because they cannot drink their water. Actually, you are already mitigating if people do this.

DH - A lot of people have water available but do not consume their own water.

AH - More a case of taking a truck up....for the recharge thing. If you can get the infiltration gallery....and it's timed to let the water go out slowly.... you could drill a well if you could rechargeYou would to be real king on a truck. (?)

DH -It could work.

CB - How many in existence today? Would rather have a cistern.

AH - Why?

CB - Would need recharge to be effective, 100%.

Rapid back-and-forth about previous conversations.

AH - If DOE says it is molecule for molecule, etc.....

CB - That's why personally , knowing how these systems work...it was recharged by rain. Jefferson county. Approved system. We sent water samples to Jefferson county. 40,000 tank under ground. Twice a year.....twice a year things got into tank. *Talk about water coming from roof with bird shit on it.*

DH - can be done. For people who can't get around it any other way .

AH - Rule says you cannot collect rainwater.

CB - issue for me - because the way water is used to manage growth. I would say do manage growth directly, and do not rely on the water issue to control that growth.

AH - in 1976 - We were appropriated so much single domestic growth. That is the limiting factor right there.

Limiting factors, population growth

CB - The arguments about how to use water have been going for a long time. Interpreting water law - the world has changed around it so much, it is not real applicable.

AH - If the population of earth stops right now,, we'd probably be ok, but that won't happen.

Cb - Population of OK county.....

AH - (interrupts)..... there won't ever be a last person who enters Ok county. What do we do?

CB -Short term interim, long term - if you make a mistake and didn't provide enough ground then 30-40 years down the road, will be more ground. but not today.

AH - what do you want to see as your limiting factor? Water/ visual appeal?

CB - That's what they did - people went around the county and gave their option of what do we want to do???? Gets into world population. Addressing more what people here want to see.

AH - Yes, those are the things you want to choose. Uses example of the Methow and how many gallons a day are designated -

CB - Asks him to clarify.

AH - I can't exceed the 2 cfs.

CB - Actually the 2cfs should be controlling factor for the zoning? But then would your objective be to zone according to where you can use water?

AH -In lower Methow, one acre zoning — you don't do that. But I also think that when you look at the lower Methow Valley, and you look at the sheer rock - that is counted into our overall buildable analysis but how many acres are covering. If our comp plan said we can't build on over 40% grade, you are left with what is actually buildable. By state standards...if I were to take a chance on property, how many

DH - Between 1 and 2 acres are the minimum. If you have perfectly square parcel, have to be over 100 yet from drain field. Math is too small. Might not work at all if another ship...we went with 2 acre minimums.

AH - Gives example of community septic systemthat's a good plan.

DH - Leave a lot of open spacecluster homes. good.

They agreewhat vision do the people have?

Tonasket Hospital Emergency

CB - All above are sort of “What If’s.” I have a problem. I understand August 1, they are going to stop OB operations at hospital?

Yes, true. Lack of population growth. Heard talk also at Mid-Valley even if they include have Tonasket’s births.

CB - losses at hospitals will be big issue for us. In EMS, same issue - volume. Medicaid reimbursement rates can keep up.

AH - Why don’t they specialize in something at each of the 3 hospitals?

JD - At least the admins now are open to discussion. *(He likes the idea of splitting up services.)*

AH - In mental health , have to have holding area.

JD - *Talks about costs per room.*

CB - talks about Dr. visits by video. Able to keep some folks here in hospitals rather than being in Wenatchee. *Need to investigate where we stand. Talks of consolidating a couple of districts to EMS. Talks about Economic Alliance ’s interests in hospitals.*

CB - If we attract a lot of seniors here, hospitals will not survive because of reimbursement rate.

AH - Consent Agenda?

Cisterns, source of water, OTA’s, Culligan

DH - Cisterns will probably need to be permitted. Board of Health will need to be involved. Can probably come up with something.

CB - Service areas/ Where are water rights defined?

AH - How does Culligan get their water?

DH - From wherever their source is. Might just be picking up municipal water.

CB - Recharge effect of water - When it comes to the service areas the municipalities are serving them.....

DH - They purchase from municipalities as a customer. Drinking is usually from a local municipalities.

CB - If used as a recognized source of water might come into play.

DH - Think about - w/ connections for exempt wells... is that an approvable process?

AH - DOE said at Grange - 2 CFS reservation - the water is for single domestic use. The fact that they have come and said group B - is it really single domestic?

I heard them say that if someone got a permit to transport river water into a single system, that is single domestic use. Just because the transportation is....why doesn't a group B system get in same way?

DH - It's like an OTA - they have to go through whole schedule of testing. But a 2 connection exempt well doesn't do that/

AH - On the OTA's - is it a \$500 license every year?

DH - There is a new fee required every year....not sure of rates.

AH - A person provided public comment that OTA fees are too much. It will come up.

DH - OTA people angry that they have to pay fees. Nothing special.

Chit-Chat: Marketing, Economics, CERB board.

JD - Anything else?

CB - Chats about a meeting he went to in Wenatchee. They talked about marketing efforts. Talks about \$\$ coming through Economic alliance .

JD - Talks about being upset by someone at these meetings.

3:55 - Randy from Rock Island is interested in economic plans. Talks about capital gains. Opportunity zones. Poverty issues.

AH - These efforts on property applying for \$50,000 grant. Why is it that Okanogan County is going to get this grant?

JD - asks about \$\$ having something to do with Maycumber and what happened with the money.

CB - congress can't just grab it. It has to do with who is paying attention to what is being approved and not approved.

AH - We should get ahold of CERB (County Economic Revitalization Board) to see if we can get two \$50,000 grants. One won't cover our diverse and large county. More talk about grants.

AH - When you say we, Twisp Works is going to apply for the planning grant. So over here, Ernie is doing it.....

CB - His proposal was to have it applicable house all - and signed off by Okanogan County. Without us signing off on it somewhere, we won't be buying in.

AH - So we will have an issue. Tell CERB - we are in a void....

CB - George Brady is on CERB Board. We are under-served because we are under requesting. I am making that request.

JD - We, WaCOG counties only. get a one-time shot. John Colton going to be here.

4:05 - That's it!

Notetaker leaves