

BOCC notes 11/20/17

JD- Jim DeTro (chair)

CB- Chris Branch (vice-chair)

AH – Andy Hover

LJ- Lalena Johns (clerk)

PH- Perry Huston (Planning Dept admin)

Josh ? (Fairgrounds manager)

This is a paraphrasing of conversations by one of several volunteer citizen note takers and published on the website of Represent Okanogan County (ROC.) Any writer's comments or explanations are in italics. For officially approved minutes of Board of Commissioner meetings, normally published at a later date, see www.okanogancounty.org.

Subjects addressed:

- **Fairground budget**
- **Supplemental appropriations (fairground, district court)**
- **WATV Ordinance (District 3)**
- **Comprehensive Plan**
- **Juvenile Facilities Funding**

Note taker arrived at 11:20 AM. Discussion about Fairgrounds budget was in progress.

Fairground budget

The discussion was about how to deal with the fairground expenses and exploring ways to possibly move certain expenses to different categories to cover costs.

AH- The Fair is outside current expense. We need to bring in the fair advisory committee and find out what they really need to operate the facility.

Josh- We need to have someone go through the buildings to make sure they are safe.

AH- Presented the idea that some maintenance items could be done by other departments (lawn mowing, snow plowing, etc.)

CB- We need more options.

Josh- Are we still talking about a lay-off?

AH- Yes, probably you will be laid off on the 5th through about February or so.

Josh departed at about 11:25.

Discussion about agenda for tomorrow. Treasurer update has been cancelled. Vintage faire discussion will take place later today.

Supplemental Appropriations

11:30 Public Hearing: Fairground supplemental appropriation. No comments from public or fairground staff. BOCC discussion.

AH- Moved to accept resolution to appropriate \$\$ from Solid Waste fund to the Facilities.
CB- seconded.

Voted to accept motion.

Discussion-

AH- The resolution was to approve the \$75K as a loan from solid waste. Then we can get the \$\$ there quicker and move fairgrounds expenses to current expense.

BOCC voted to approve to authorize loan.

PH departed at 11:35.

11:40- Public hearing to approve supplemental appropriation \$16K for district court.

No public comments, no staff comments. BOCC moves to accept resolution to fund the supplemental request.

Discussion:

AH- At some point we will have to figure out how to get the budget in a place where supplementals are not needed. Where can we take \$\$ from? The district court is not a good example, but we might want to think about putting a cap on the extra funds that are doled out.

JD- We are pushing the envelope constantly.

BOCC voted to approve supplemental.

Adjourned for lunch.

1:30 pm.

WATV Ordinance (District 3)

Public Hearing- ATV Roads, North County.

JD- Jim DeTro (chair)

CB- Chris Branch (vice-chair)

AH – Andy Hover

LJ- Lalena Johns (clerk)

JT- Josh Thompson – Public works engineer

PH- Perry Huston

10 members of the public present.

JD- Opened discussion to staff.

PH- Mentioned that WATV proposal has been opened for discussion. Received additional comments since last hearing. SEPA review has been done. There was a determination of non-significance. When ordinance is written, various details will be addressed in the recitals. Attachment A will be the list of the roads that will be opened, Attachment B will be the maps and Attachment C will be the ?

If you add or subtract roads today, the attachments will need to be changed to reflect that.

AH- WDFW sent us comments. I don't have the sheet with me. There were some concerns about Eder Rd, Poehmann rd, Woodward Rd, Van der Scheldon Rd..

WDFW felt that there was adequate fencing on Poechman & Woodward Rds, but they need more signs. They would like Van der Scheldon Rd removed due to conservation easements in proximity. A local resident requested that Eder Rd be removed from the list. We have covered a lot of the issues with our mitigation procedures. In order for us to impose a fine for off-road ridership, how would that work?

PH- We would work with the prosecutors office to create language. As I read the RCW, you could adopt more restrictive requirements if you want.

AH- For the proper procedure of removing the two roads discussed, should we make a motion to remove them and then amend the list later?

PH- Explained Roberts Rules and how to comply to make changes. Another option would be to direct Planning Dept to create the required documents that would achieve the end result.

CB_ We received a lot of other comments that I want to address. There were more requests to remove roads from the list that we didn't opt for. I think it's important to acknowledge that even if we didn't adopt these road openings, we would still have folks breaking the law by riding AVTs on them. Either way we will need to rely on enforcement. We need to make the penalties legitimate and effective. I think the penalties should be fairly stiff. If we leave the roads closed to ATVs, we will still have the sheriff being called when someone doesn't like what's happening.

PH- You always have the option of closing any particular road later.

CB- We need to be aware of tourism impacts, etc.

AH- Regarding the ORV/WATV issue., some roads are only open to one of those categories. Signage will only be for WATV's - I think that will make it clear.

JT- The rules say that ORVs have to be signed.

CB- For someone who lives there, for example, what difference will that person see on the road signs?

JD- There are bills in process to streamline this stuff statewide. Speed limits, etc. We may have to change signs again.

PH- Did the BOCC want to open for public comment today?

AH- I don't know. We said we would leave written comment open, but not take public comment today.

JD- is there anyone here who would like to comment today?

One person raised his hand.

BOCC agreed to hear comments as long as it is not repetitive.

Spencer King- President of ATV club. We sent in a letter on WATV vs ORV routes. I have a constituent who worked on state law, and they are clearing up some confusing language. I understand we can't do anything with the 35 mph limit now, but want to say that there is more work being done.

AH- Moved to direct staff to create the enabling documents that would have an ordinance on our books for WATV travel in District 3.

Motion voted and carried.

AH- Moved to amend exhibit A and B to remove Eder road and Van der Schelden rd from the list.

BOCC- Motion voted and carried.

PH- Clarified that BOCC can continue the public hearing to create the ordinance.

AH- Moved to continue the public hearing to 11/27 at 1:30 pm to consider the ordinance.

CB- Is this the normal procedure to adopt an ordinance in a public hearing? People expect that if there is a public hearing that comments will be taken.

PH- It's how we have been doing it, but you could have a closed public hearing, or just put it on your consent agenda as an alternative. In terms of today, we can follow history and then have a discussion about doing it differently in the future.

BOCC voted and carried to have a public hearing for considering ATV ordinance on 11/27.

All of the public left at this time except Lorah Super.

BOCC went into executive session for 20 minutes to discuss legal issues.

2:42- executive session adjourned, resume public meeting.

Planning dept update:

Comprehensive Plan

PH- Introduced the beginnings of comp plan review.

You have 2 basic documents in front of you. The first is what is currently on the books, the other outlines the required elements of a comprehensive plan. We should create our vision statement first, then follow the book for guidance on what to include.

The Vision Statement should lay out in broad terms of what you want your comp plan to accomplish.

Once you have that, then you do your Land Use element. The approach many take is to designate resource lands, especially those that have significance: Agricultural, Forest, and Mineral. You look at local resources. In the current plan, we had a Recreational designations. Everything that is left over, and not part of an incorporated town, is designated "Rural". The requirement is to have enough to accommodate projected growth and other needs.

We have to deal with water, and can do it in various ways. One way is to have a whole separate section that addresses water. The other way is to include water issues in each section as appropriate.

We have to address quantity, quality, and legality of water rights. The water rights section was a policy statement addressing mostly Ag, but also development. We can't specifically dictate what people can do, but can suggest mitigations, etc.

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires resource lands and critical areas. If we get into policy level discussion about critical areas, we can include wetlands, wildfire,

flood mgmt., etc. the main question right now is what areas are the BOCC most interested in.

CB- The vision statement is important. The current vision statement is in conflict with itself.

PH- The desire was to make it short and simple.

CB- Led discussion about the language in vision statement as written now. He pointed out that there is no way that the county can just say that anyone can do what they want. There has to be some acknowledgement that regulation is part of the reality. The current statement says that OK county is a place where everyone can pursue their dreams. CB points out that not everyone has the same dream.

PH- We hear most of all about conflicting land use desires. We need to think about the future and what resources are available. We can say that we know that we need to monitor our use and adjust accordingly.

CB- The vision statement is not the final rule, but it should guide us. In other comp plans you see language such as “rural character” and “wise use of resources”. It affects our quality of life. I’m inclined to embrace a vision statement that says something about preserving “rural character”.

AH- Here’s something from Carbon County (rural WY). Achieve a sustainable balance between energy development, environment. Etc etc. He cited summary of what they say in their comp plan. Pointed out that even though they are rural, they have some pretty specific goals. They don’t just say “everybody live free”.

PH- Philosophized for a while about what level of concern people have about all of these things.

CB- If you took all of those goals (from Carbon County) and capture them in a vision statement, we would be close. Historical uses are something to consider, but it’s relative.

AH- If you took a census of the OK county residents, you would find rural way of life would be pretty high on the list.

PH- We have done that, and found that it is. Where it becomes problematic is when you start talking about specific items.

CB- If you took away the context that it is a plan that is being imposed by the govt, and presented it in terms of it being a plan that is created by the residents for the residents, it would be more acceptable.

AH- It’s not so much about the specific number of lots, it’s more about density of people.

General discussion about what rural character means, what is a “big” lot, or “enough room” (some say 5 acres, some say 20, etc).

AH- Asked to see the different drafts of the OK county vision statement over the last 10 years or so to see how it evolved.

CB- Related accounts of conversations where people always say what they need, but said that the real question is what do you want the county to look and be like in 20-50 years? That's what the vision statement should say. Most people will say they don't want it to change much.

PH- offered to write a draft vision statement for BOCC review.

PH- Does the BOCC have any objection to him addressing the resource lands in a more traditional approach? *Note taker not sure what he meant by this.* Explained that GMA counties have certain requirements that we don't have. We don't have to adopt protective requirements. I propose that recreation resource would go away, and would revert to one of the other three categories. The previous method of addressing resource lands was driven by concern about cattle grazers getting prohibited from using certain types of resources.

CB- No use would take precedence over any other use. That's one way to manage it. We can designate resource lands, but need to have strong tools for managing them appropriately. We need policies that address protection. Then we can address zoning, rules, or maybe even incentives. Preserving Ag lands will result from policy that allows for Ag to be profitable.

AH- Cattle grazing in the forest, and someone hiking, for example. USFS sees those two things as equal. I think we need to address sustainability.

PH- Designation criteria are handed to us- we need to interpret them. I can write an introduction that will take from the vision statement and have a more detailed description of resource lands.

Rural lands are supposed to be where you site housing and commercial. I don't see a lot of change with this. Assuming that we have a separate section about water.

CB- It seems like it might make sense to address critical areas and resource lands first, so that it's clear before you start talking about what you can do in the rural areas.

PH- We will be expanding the definition of "critical area". For example, we might include fire prone areas, which is not traditional, but could apply to us.

AH- Asked about growth predictions, and why the previous BOCC used the numbers they did.

PH- The projections impact whether we are required to use GMA language. We can re-visit the growth projections if you like. We will have a new set of projections next year. Of course in 2020 we will have census numbers. We can update with numbers from the last 2 years and see if we are still on track with what we previously thought.

AH- There are outside influences that affect growth. I want our plan to have sound technical data behind it. I want to be able to defend our decision if challenged.

PH- I was one who argued for using higher numbers in the past. I believe that there are more people here than show up on the official records. I would suggest that we do our population calculations without trying to stay below any GMA requirements. Just do our best and see where we end up.

CB- We need to look at how many live on rural lands, and how many in the towns. We need to see where our potential growth should be directed.

JD- Just go back and see how long it took to get from 35K to 40K population.

AH- We need to anticipate change as much as possible.

PH- We have to do some level of population projection and have enough rural land to absorb that growth. We should just do it without trying to skew it low or high for different purposes.

CB- Let's be real about it. Bottom line.

PH- Moving on. Last item on planning. The planning commission did not have a quorum for their meeting last week so they could not address the nightly rental and water issues that were on the agenda. Another meeting has been re-scheduled.

Juvenile Facilities funding

BOCC – Moved and voted to approve special fund for Juvenile facilities. This will accommodate the new tax funds that were approved by voters.

Note taker departed 3:40 pm.