

Board of County Commissioners
Notes
Jan. 4, 2016

Jim Detro – JD (BOCC)
Ray Campbell – RC (BOCC)
Sheilah Kennedy – SK (BOCC)
Perry Huston – PH (County Planner)

Albert Lin – AH (Prosecutor)
Lanie Johns – LJ (BOCC clerk)
Rocky Jackson - Attorney dealing w/ personnel issues for cry

Arrived at 9:10 an immediate Executive Session about possible litigation from 9:15 – 9:40?

MISC. -

Critical areas in Southwest:

JD – read materials from McKenzie (*email or text information, this apparently New Mexico?*). Critical areas for Jaguars apparently not a problem to ranchers. Sonoma Ranch bought water rights to enhance Jaguar habitat from Rosemont mine. Fish & Wildlife wouldn't allow transfer of water to mine so the mine closes. *Apparently mine and jaguar can share water?*

Kinross

Kinross is maybe open another year, there are depth restrictions from USFS agreement. Need to re-open to see if Kinross can go deeper. Kinross does not want BOCC to intervene under coordination as they do not want to stir up problems in other areas – Round Mtn NV, Ft Know in AK. JD – sees Bundy's got involved with Hammond Deal – from McKenzie again. Between JD & RC – nodding of heads in agreement over protest. Quotes assertion of constitutional rights. (*These items brought up as continuing background to point how uncooperative and obstructionist the USFS to resource extraction.*)

BOCC Absences

RC – May take last week of Month off Jan. 25 – 29).
JD – Gone first week in February 2/5 - 14.
Sk – gone 27 – 29 of Jan.

General reviewing of schedule for upcoming and making sure a quorum of BOCC is around.
Quad County will meet 2/12 @ Ferry County.

SK – Car was paid for on Nov. 25 – (Referring to Something in Exec Session?) LJ – did not receive budget numbers for “that” dept.

JD – asking about Charlene Groomes (CG) coming in on Tuesday. SK – CG called on Thurs. wanting specifics on “that” employee. LJ – checking to make sure CG will be able to attend.

In discussion of scheduling it was clear BOCC is moving ahead with plan to have quarterly meetings with County Department and Agency heads. During Budget process BOCC felt they were out of touch and not on top of things. This is informational and gives the BOCC a chance to touch base with the various heads.

Okanogan Behavioral Health Care (OBHC) & Employee Asst. Benefit

SK – questions on Employee Asst. Benefit (EAB) & OBHC. What does “employer” mean, wording issue over some confusion and need to be consistent throughout the document. Change to County. Other concern of whether termination of that agreement or of employee – seems to be contract between County & OBHC. – issue is continuation of services in ongoing cases if terminated. LJ – not aware of Stress Mgmt workshops provided by OBHC. Sk questions if necessary when county has paid for sessions in Moses Lake and there is no history of being done by OBHC despite provision in contract. If OBHC willing to do session locally at \$35 per hour maybe should use OBHC as opposed to all day Moses lake seminar. OBHC & EAB contract- concern of counseling sessions not covered by insurance. Why would county pay overages? LJ – only if work related issues. May need to clarify language to make sure Mental Health overage is clearly work related. (As BOCC is changing language will need to go back for renegotiation between parties. This item removed from Consent Agenda for today..) Tanya clarifies that this is a change from current procedures. HIPPA rules prevent County from “knowing” too much. (JD particularly, but also RC, not specifically following this discussion) Renewal clause also confusing. This will come out of consent agenda. And reviewed. County needs to make sure insurance first, then petition County through Human Relations, billing issuing not questioning need. Can’t clearly separate work, not work if outside affecting work performance.

MISC.

LJ – Phone call about a person not receiving notice of decision from Board of Equalization (B)E). Mix-up over communication – LJ looking into problem. Apparently BOE missed problem due to fires. LJ & SK – how to resolve. LJ going to remind BOE of responsibility to be on top of duties. Bad reflection on County.

Back to Bundy / Hammond – Problem is assertion of power by State / Federal over people in West.

Union Issues - SK – Rocky Jackson wants opportunity to have a phone call over a couple of personnel issues tomorrow afternoon?

RC, SK & JD plan to attend Joel Kretz meeting with fire chiefs and others. This will be a continuation of BOCC meeting so is a public meeting. This to discuss Initial Attack proposals.

RC, SK & LJ asking about rollover of parts of Juvenile. Detention Budget. RC – *(whispering, talking low – can't follow)* This over car issue from last year. County wants to recover cost of car

that Juvie purchased without authorization. Juvie \$s roll into County current expense budget with new year.

RC, SK & JD – discussion of drilling issue & well problem with Ameresco (company drilling well for courthouse geothermal project) Driller had used bad procedure. Need 2 suitable wells – injection and extraction for geothermal. Need good extraction base material (gravel or cobble) so can take out without sand issues. Need separation between to drill sites so works properly.

RC & JD – Discussion over Fire District #6 levy rate. Much higher than other fire districts. Were approved by local voters – many issues.

Community Action & Homelessness Grant

SK & LJ – discussion of plan and implementation of homelessness grant. No ID of how plan was to reduce Homelessness by 50%. This was supposed to be a 10 yr. plan goal. This year is the end of the grant (July) and need to assess if/how the goal was met. Other plans to meet goals around in draft, - previous boards did not finalize or follow through. *(JD comes in talking loudly on cell phone, makes it difficult to follow.)* Community Action getting \$70,000 a year, can't find any evidence to show have reduced. An additional \$30,000 in play. Need to bring in Lael (Duncan) of Community Action to talk about Plan and meeting goals appears to be a lack of evidence to properly evaluate if the goals were met or not. Affordable Housing – SK is concerned about \$ and still hearing about so much homelessness. RC following. JD does after phone call. \$280,000 in Homeless fund, Affordable Housing is going to submit \$ to access money – also OBHC. Will have to go through Community Action but is up in the air. LJ mentioning some places for sale that might provide temporary housing. Community Action wants to build new housing up near clinic on Tollefson property. SK suggests need to look elsewhere – old nursing home in Okanogan (LJ)? SK says all these things building up, this is same person that had issues over salary. JD relates previous problem with extra high % on previous grant for admin expenses. LJ – Commerce & she monitor admin fees, but Community Action can take its own Admin fees also. There is a large amount of \$ that go to admin with Com. Action, a lot to salary and contracts. RC – says a lot of \$ not getting to people who need the help. Com. Action reserves a lot of % outside of county. LJ needs criteria used to evaluate Homelessness grant. Feels Com. Action not following through. This has a long term history of difficulty. *(BOCC showing real concern here; waste of \$, no evidence of success, inadequate information)*. There will be a special meeting of Co. Action Bd on Jan. 13. Concern is over too much money going to organization and not enough to action.

Inadequate PILT Payments

SK – PILT payments, not keeping up with land value. Need to get PILT fully from legislature & governor. Lengthy discussion with myself as relates to Pilt \$, why WD F&W pays so little compared to DNR and Fed. (Fed. Is a totally different process.)

Lunch: RC & SK return from Lunch at 1:35, JD follows shortly.

Methow River instream flow

PH – Water in stream flow issue in Methow. Watershed Council pushing issue from last week about reallocating priority of water in Methow. Meeting on Friday am. Effort is to get more water to cities. Meeting with Watershed Council address issue, DOE will not address without county support of issue. RC – County will move forward for now. PH has sent scope of work draft to BOCC. Scope includes 1) water to cities 2) Open closed basins (RC says this is very controversial meaning developing water storage possibility). SK don't want to water down efforts and lose water to cities as a result. RC says DOE most favorable he has seen in years. PH whole change in a rule is a big process. *(RC is on the Watershed Council or at least attends).* PH 1) most easily done, but still some opposition. 2) would have a lot of opposition. Water storage would be very difficult. PH – a big question in opening basin for what purpose, will invite concern. Storage is equally problematic. PH & RC contend 2cfs per reach set aside are not being used, so are looking at reallocation. RC still contends 2cfs per reach has not been exhausted. PH feels that 2cfs could be used by towns for 'domestic' uses. RC says whole issue is just moving towns up in priority over set aside. This would avoid 2cfs issue. PH contends more water in Methow basin that can ever be reasonably used. RC – need to get data from all the various gauging stations at each reach to see if water is there or not. (This implies all previous statements are anecdotal, not facts to support effort. They recognize they need to back up their anecdotes with evidence). RC feels ground water withdrawal not connected to current stream flow. RC feels irrigation ditches were a big factor in groundwater replenishment. So summary: 1) water to town, 2) least intrusive process with goal to priority allocation to move towns above in stream flow set aside. No acceptance that 2cfs set aside is being used up.

VSP

– 120 day requirement in contract to submit work plan in question. PH now unsure what that is. Not in RCW or other official but is in signed contract that County submitted? PH has sent selection criteria draft and ad to BOCC for VSP Work Group. PH – must protect critical areas while protecting agriculture. Dept. of Commerce has indicated 4 county's plans as being acceptable. These are still subject to litigation. SK – does State Farm Bureau have a plan for working on/ with VSP? RC – not actually seen or aware of such a plan or recommendation. PH – existence of word "enhancement" in Critical Areas part of VSP is a source of concern. VSP are required to identify & enhance critical areas. Only when grow or change Ag does critical area come in. SK - Individual Farm Plan for Conservation District, SK says Con. plans might be good examples? PH says they are management plans and not same thing. PH – need to consider need to monitor if work plan is doing what it is supposed to do. Or else would default to GMA. Need to establish a baseline for Critical Areas that will be measuring point. CAO will be side by side with VSP. SK – where does enforcement fall? PH – a totality look, if monitoring shows shortfall then either fix work plan or default to GMA. PH – work group 1st priority to determine criteria for monitoring & making baselines. 2 things overlap. Only applies in critical areas, not elsewhere.

(PH speaks of himself as highly qualified to run process. Much of this discussion comes across as an opening of surprise package. Upon closer looks more and more details and implications

are coming out. It's hard to say if this is intentional creeping out of details into public discussion or coming as details being discovered as a diving into VSP and CAO details.)

RC – streams & banks are critical areas? PH – springs, seeps, banks, streams all critical. PH feels if a 2011 baseline established only deal with those critical areas – frozen in space/time? If a change in Ag would need to prove no effect on critical area.

Left for next meeting.