

BOCC
Dec. 19, 2017

Jim Detro – JD
Ray Campbell – RC
Andy Hover - AH
Lanie Johns – LJ

Albert Lin – AL
Perry Huston – PH
Josh Thompson - JT

All writer's comments are in italics. This is a paraphrasing of conversations. As this has periods of BOCC work time there are extended periods of BOCC members looking at a variety of papers, reading correspondence on computers, emailing and texting. All BOCC members are present at opening.

General Misc. Intro, West Chewuch Speed Limit hearing, Gold Creek Loop Speed Limit hearing, Public Works Report. – ECD in Public Health Bldg, Solid Waste manager, Leachate issues, Advisory Committee on ATVs and Snowmobiles,; Supplement Hearing on Jail, Public Hearing on Interim Hirst Regulations, Nightly Rentals, Fairground, Misc.

9:10 JD & RC also AH, SK Absent.

Quiet chatting between JD & RC – can't hear. (Discussing some road conditions somewhere given current weather.

JD – some hearing examiner (woman) had mind already made up. RC nods in agreement. She was in bed (*expression*) with one side. Spoon fed?

AH with RC & JD – asks about E. Chewuch vs. W. Chewuch road on agenda. It is W. Chewuch not E. This is area of Dog Creek & Andrews Creek area. AH brings up ATV issue. JD replies whether County takes jurisdiction on a road they need to weight whether cost to County outweighs desire to open to ATV or other usage.

LJ – discussing bills from Borderland Historical Society – painting contractor, etc.

9:40 LJ hands JD & RC thick stack of comments for the public hearing – concerning Hirst? Or road speed limits?

9:45 Many people from the Methow showing up for Public hearing – completely fills the hearing room, 100+? PW & JT +PW helper arrive.

West Chewuch Speed Limit hearing

10:00 PH – hearing regarding speed limit change on W. Chewuch road. JT – quotes RCW – local authority can determine reasonable and safe limit. Roads risk and operating limits are criteria. Survey what usage is and determine what 85% of people are going as target speed, then decrease/increase in respect to local conditions. Based on the concept that 85% of people are reasonable. (Motorists have to be aware of issues and recognizing current conditions – poor record on public actions, many incidents go unreported). Road risk includes such items as – local jurisdictions, town limits, school zones, etc. PW has surveyed roads in question and have recommendations. Currently 35 mph from Hwy 20 out to .4 mi., after that 50 mph. 4 accidents have been reported in last few years. 2 surveys on segment 1 (35 mph zone – 47 mph on one study, 47 on second survey, average speed was 41 mph; 0.49 mi. to 5.3 mi. – 85% speed was 54 mph (straight road), from 5.3 mi. to end of pavement at 6.77 mi.; 85% was 47 mph (a lot of curves in this segment). Good engineering survey supports reducing to 35 mph.

Many comments – most don't see need to reduce, they don't want ATV which might allow if it is posted 35 mph – BOCC emphasizes this is untrue. Saying that this is a separate process. No procedural problem as engineering report not required before a Public Hearing from PW.

RC instigated process to change speed limit. RC feels a time pressure to examine the issue. RC went to look at the road personally. He feels that the upper part is difficult and should have a lower limit and to go ahead and throw rocks at him if disagree with his opinion.

Isabelle S. – concern about posting and advertisement of agenda not following correct procedure. Feels 35 mph is OK along upper section but need to post no ATV signs.

Hugh G. – lived there for a long time. He has seen 8 accidents in his area in 48 yrs and feels it is dangerous and needs to reduce speed as some vehicles end up in his property. RC interjects his explanation.

Charles H. – has witnessed 4 accidents on road, lived 11 years on W. Chewuch road. He has an ATV and not requesting ATV access at this time. He has counted a number of MPH signs along the road – 27 in total, only 2 say 50 mph.

Roxie M. – likes to recreate and lives along road. Major road and has a lot of business traffic. She doesn't feel traffic load was a problem and doesn't feel a need to lower speed limit.

Mike R. – he's an avid cyclist, has ridden W. Chewuch at least 15 times this summer. He has never had a problem with traffic, and he sees much more difficulty in urban areas. He has not issue with current speed.

Phil M. – comments that that is was initiated by RC now by PW as stated. Questions enforceability.

Melanie R. – from MVCC. Limited basis to discuss as they had no Engineering report ahead of time. Concerned about inability to make informed comment as a consequence. Questions hazard of road – wonders if accidents commented on is disproportional to other road areas. Why this road down to 35 mph when there are many roads at 50 mph that seem just as twisty. JD interrupts for time limit reasons. Lower the speed limit on the upper section if any, worries about this being a step towards ATV usage.

Gay N. – only problem is with trucks throwing bottles. Feels that public testimony not noticed by BOCC. Sees this as a possible example of government ignoring public.

Karen M. – 48 comments against, several for. Concerned that this process is moving toward ATV usage.

Greg K. – Drives and lives up there since 1981. He doesn't see an increase in traffic, but less logging trucks, more bicycles, doesn't see many worries. Does see a need for a guardrail and speed limits in specific areas. He feels upper section needs 35 mph but not other areas.

Jim R. – lived up there 14 years, he's a runner and cyclist. He feels issue is exaggerated as to safety, not a problem to him. Not in favor of speed reduction.

Shane – lives in W. Chewuch, drives the road frequently. Sees no real traffic increase. He doesn't see any data to support change. Lowering would fly in the face of public and cause public concern. People generally cautious so no real need to change. Feels ATV addition will make the road more unsafe. Creating an issue without justification.

Gold Creek Loop Speed Limit hearing

10:45 Public Hearing on Gold Creek Loop speed limit change. JT – he has been aware of a possible need to reduce the speed limit for some time. There is a fairly low traffic volume on road and no reported accidents. 85% is under 30 mph on the lower section, 35 mph on the upper. Average mph is in the lower 20s. 6 written comments – 4 support the change, 2 against with no ATV usage.

Melanie R. – MVCC is in favor of a lower speed limit on Gold Creek Loop. This change was initiated by PW. She doesn't feel ATV usage is a motive in this case. Public supports change. There does need to be a bar on ATV usage.

Phil – supports change on Gold Creek Loop, agrees and supports JT & BOCC.

BOCC – RC wants to continue this until 12/28 @ 11:00 am. He want to include SK in the process. JD – reminds public that Ag. usage of an ATV is authorized in our county if for Ag activity & is reasonable usage.

Public Works Report. – ECD in Public Health Bldg, Solid Waste manager, Leachate issues, Advisory Committee on ATVs and Snowmobile

11:05 Ben Rough – BR . There is not a lot of meeting times available between now and end of year. Budget is about done. Need to get it to the Auditor's Office tomorrow. Early Child Development wants to move into Public Health building and share space with Public Health and PW. BR has sent some clarification questions to the director the program. The building has ample space to accommodate the move. ECD has done a minimal search for alternatives in Okanogan and would rent would go to upkeep and improvements. RC – is the electrical OK? BR – ECD would pay a pro rata cost of the building costs based on the occupied square footage. He has some concern about clients on weekend trainings, some might get out of their areas and cause a problem. JD – in reading the ECD goals that it is to support getting 90% of children ready for Kindergarten by 2020. JD – recommends that BR go ahead and explore possible a lease. Appreciates the revenue and little bit of help for the county's children.

Solid Waste will offer director position to a former Waste Management employee who is currently a manager of an assisted living outfit in the Portland, OR area. She has a lot of experience in fiscal management. Betty Conley is highly recommended. Her husband is a previous landfill employee.

Leachate lagoon – need to speed up recycling of leachate onto cells. Okanogan City is doing is analysis. There has been some concern about how Parametrics calculates the cost of closing a cell. Data on costs of closure, issues involved and new cell development are the concerns. Some concern about overfunding of closure fund and BR feels the new manager has the background to look at the issues. RC has a concern about having the same company getting the contract for monitoring and engineering rolled over without looking at competitors. BR – Parametrics needs to be watched but they are a quality organization. RC & JD want to go ahead and approve Parametrics to receive contract. Motion and 2nd to approve. There will be a contract to be approved later.

There will be a meet and greet for the BOCC with the new manager in January. BR will look into closure costs.

The Advisory Committee on ATVs and Snowmobiles met. Training an new groomer operator for snowmobile trails (County is paying for grooming and maintaining snowmobile trails? Why is this a county role while other recreation is not a County role?)

A large number of job titles and descriptions are changing, this is a routine update and has been in cooperation with the Union. NO duties will change.

RC - comments on new Solid Waste manager, BR says looks like a good hire.

Greg Knott & BOCC exchange comments on West Chewuch road.

From 11:45 informal taking until lunch.

1:20 Many people in for hearing on Hirst interim regulations.

Supplement Hearing on Jail

Supplement Hearing on Jail, \$5000 project at jail, no comments. Okayed.

Public Hearing on Interim Hirst Regulations.

JD goes over procedures – no Q & A to the BOCC. This is a public comment period opportunity. PH – this is concerning Interim Code 2016 – 5: They are taking input on Title 20 and then on 2016 – 5. Interim came about in response to Hirst ruling and from Land Use attorney (Mackie).

Exempt wells need to go before County. This is a County duty. NO legal process was in place prior to Hirst. The question today is what process to use. 1) Site analysis, the same fee schedule as before, County will look at whether this is a new use; after this it goes to Hearing Examiner. Need a well log, pertinent site specific data. County will put together all available information to develop a water available map for the public to use. This will be a baseline for moving forward. County vesting language is now consistent with the state. County rule needs to be consistent with applicable statutes.

Jeremy B. – Pres. Of Wa. State Ground Water Assn. – drillers, etc. he's from Kittitas Co. He is concerned that there is a lack of access to new wells and has stopped a lot of building. BOCC has control to establish a procedural trail to improve the problem. As building improves then the water available improves.

Chester L. – Okanogan Drilling – (asks for a show of hands from driller present). Doesn't know of many exempt well drilling that has affected instream flow (priority of Hirst). Worries about impact of restriction.

Ron P. – Part of Methow Watershed – 2016-5 not needed, not appropriate. Hirst decision does not affect Okanogan. Says that Methow rules already adequate, they are current and potential domestic usage is insignificant. Ok. Co. should reject 2015-5. JD – current rule is only interim.

4. Greg K. – Methow Watershed Council gut appearing only for himself. Lives up the W. Chewuch. Referring only to the Methow watershed. Current procedures and rules are adequate and Hirst does not affect. He feels that the Hearing Examiner process is not necessary for the Methow. Okanogan R. has no rule and he realizes that the county might need a rule that covers all areas. Basically he fully supports what County is doing in terms of Baseline map.

Brian D. MVCC – Does not want every building project to go before Hearing Examiner. Should be approved by the Planning Dept. no a Hearing Examiner. Set up a Baseline and gather appropriate data for the process.

Isabelle S. – Make sure that new buildings do not impact senior water rights. Planning needs to concentrate building where water is available. Planning needs to be in charge, if appealed the go to a local Hearing Examiner.

Rocky D. – ReMax Oroville. Hirst affect local land values and stopped or stalled much realty business. This drop could be a “taking” and County might be libel. Realtors need a clear and dependable process. Hopes process will be streamlined.

Paul C. – sees the Methow situation from fallout from Early Winters. A lot of studies have been done in the Methow. He feels current information and plans in the Methow are adequate and should be relied upon. Has a USGS Study that lays out where wells are and have been studied. County has this on record.

John W. - Methow watershed plan already in the record on the new Comprehensive Plan. There needs to be a comparable record/plan on the other half of the County. Plenty of information is available.

Chester L. – many of the property owners are from the Westside. They just want a place to camp, they won't file a building permit but want a water source. The present plan process does not address these people.

Caldwell-Banker Realtor – speaking as an individual. Hirst has had a chilling effect. There needs to be a process 1) bare land, 2) what of unregistered wells?, 3) bare land with a well and not registered, needs a process.

Boyd W. – wants a time frame for getting a suitable process.

PH – no new info., it falls on the County to develop an adequate process. Process needs to be based on a record of information. Once a decision is made it has to have a short appeal process that ends any further challenge.

RC – BOCC has enough info to go on and will come back with a decision at a later time.

JD – When decision came down the goal was to make sure to not overburden landowners. Goal was to develop a clear pathway. He feels Methow 2 cfs instream study in RCW is adequate. County currently has a Comprehensive Plan under litigation that complicates the issue.

RC – recognizes above issues and proceeding very carefully to avoid additional litigation. Looking at Wed., Dec. 28 @ 2:30 for deliberation and decision.

PH – suggests leaving open written comment period as Title 20 & more were not discussed. This is agreed to.

Nightly Rentals

2:45 PH – vesting date for nightly rentals is Jan. 20, 21 or 9/2005 to present, before that time a rental is grandfathered. No good info from Public Health at this time. There will need to be an annual permit. Want to contrast 9/2005 vs. current. RC wants to get info before making a decision. PH - only one person is being held up at this time. RC – there are some that came up after 2005 that took no legal process. Now Public Health is integrated with County there is less of a problem.

Tonasket EMT Business

2:52 Adjourn as BOCC, reconvene s Tonasket EMT Board. – trying to complete process of closing Tonasket EMT and changing to Lifeline.

1. L & I need documents to clear up closing of books. Wants EMT Board to sign and mailed, moved and passed.
2. Claims of 2 out of 3 almost done, last claim needs to be contacted.
3. Negotiation with Lifeline – they want a longterm contract and capital improvements on building PH will move forward with Tonasket City about building. (There needs to be a formal Fulfillment Document showing transfer of the building).

Adjournment as Tonasket EMT, reconvene as BOCC.

Fairground

Review – contracts for usage. Christmas and New Years. Security has not obtained but working on it. There is insurance.

Restrooms – bid has gone to paper and contract competitive bids are out and in official County paper. RC wants to know specifics about where published and wants in other local periodicals. PH will look into this.

Misc.

RC – when will PH have a discussion with Sandy Mackie? PH – will check with Mackie about consulting and with BOCC tomorrow afternoon.

RC – would like to see a timetable for 2016-5 and Hirst decision. PH – depends on specifics being available before Dec. 28 meeting. Move towards a decision and use meeting with Mackie tomorrow afternoon to narrow details.

JD – wants to go back to “original” constitution where it says if your not a land owner you can't vote.

JD & RC reading over some BOCC minutes for review and approval.

PH – wanders through complaining about bookkeeping firm for Tonasket EMT still billing for services. The account being billed has already been deleted and despite that the firm has been billing for two months now.

3:15 – 3:37 Quiet reading & review of minutes, letters, phone – email & Text?, computers.

Approval of Dec. 6 Minutes.

Note taker leaves.