

Board of Okanogan County Commissioners
2/25/2019

Present:

Jim DeTro - JD, BOCC
Chris Branch - CB, BOCC
Andy Hover - AH, BOCC
Lanie Johns - AJ, Clerk of the Board
Perry Huston - PH, Director of Planning and Development, Admin Officer
Chief Mike Warden - MW - Chief Deputy, Sheriff communications
Angie Hubbard - AHu, Planning Department staff
Josh Thomson - JT, County Engineer

This is a summary of the meeting by one of several volunteer citizen note takers and published on the website of Okanogan County Watch (countywatch.org.) The normal more detailed notes are not available today at the beginning of the meeting, due to technical difficulties. 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.

Summary of Significant Actions and Discussions:

Public hearing: Wheeled ATV's - opening roads in District 1, part of District 2; written comment closed, meeting continued to March 25, 1:30 PM. **Capital Facilities:** Resolution for ballot; remodeled vs new Juvenile facility. **WRIA 49 update:** new sound system for phone call-ins; funding issues; **Public hearing: Cannabis ordinances approved (OCC 17A.290, 17A.220)** to replace interim controls; 5-acre minimums; cannabis vs. industrial hemp, **Needed work on Comp Plan/Zoning: Odors & lighting** issues in re cannabis raise need to address lighting county-wide; changes in zoning to address **incompatible uses**. **Long-term Planning position funding:** Planning/Roads Dept's, Oroville, OCOG?

1:30 Public Hearing - Opening Roads to Wheeled All-Terrain Vehicles, District 1 and part of District 2.

Opening comments:

AH clarifies - USFS is responsible on their property. On private property, the owners can address property damage, etc. JD: Claims it is really ok to ride on USFS roads at this time because the USFS is under the "old plan." USFS law enforcement has been told they cannot issue tickets. AH discusses: we have the signs, have figured out the signs for closure. There is access to files online. Whether we open today or put off to April seems a little odd.

Public Comments: Summary

Spencer King and several other gentlemen who utilize WATV's and advocate for their usage testified regarding the need and desirability of WATV access for many purposes, that they are safe, and the fact that the ATV club monitors riders.

Lorah Waters Super testified for the Methow Valley Citizens' Council regarding the need for riders to carry maps, mitigation measures to be in effect before roads are opened, the need for the county to confer with other government agencies, and the need for involved agencies to enforce. Isabelle Spohn of Twisp agreed with these points and asked whether opening the roads now under consideration could predetermine opening of roads in the Methow Valley which connect with these roads. JT explained that the three major roads of concern open only up to USFS, DNR, or private land. She also stated that noise was also a major concern in quiet areas.

Discussion: State bills; is riding on USFS roads is currently legal?; continuance of hearing until March 25, 2019

JD - There are several bills at the state, so legislation may change very soon. Should we continue and watch the bills closely for now?

PH - It's up to BOCC. Nothing to drive the schedule. Continue to March 11th study session? Wait for updates on legislature, etc? March 25th is 4 weeks out.

CB - We have the issue of signs. I understand if signs are not out - that opens a real challenge. When we get signs up, that should establishStill, we need to decide whether or not they need to carry a map. No matter what legislature does, they still will not be allowed to travel off roads.

PH - Comments were made in re District 3 - that work on signs could be done whenever possible. If you delay decision, give us ideas as to what you want to monitor.

CB - Are there any issues that have come up in District 3? Not thinking about delaying any mitigations, but we are not in the season yet.

JT - Complaints: I only see track reports. In 5 years, I've had two complaints.

AH - Our choices are:

*Adopt these roads and get signs as soon as we can. We have decided to use brown reflectors.

*Can push off to point when we know we will have the signs, finish hearings, and then sign the roads.

JT - By end of March, we will have signs.

AH - I would move to extend the public hearing to March 25, 1:30 PM.

AH - Josh said signs would be in at end of March. Look for this so that we can immediately begin signing the roads. Some roads may be under 4 feet of snow.

CB - It seems mostly to be 1) a trust issue. (Will you do what you say you are going to do?) and 2) resolve the map carrying issue.

AH - There are two sides to the map-carrying issue. Maybe we should restrict comments to that at the next hearing.

CB - Re trust, this might help people. Says that not everyone can get off the internet.

AH - We have woodcutting maps....how much do those cost to print?

JD - Consider that weather will change, road restrictions will go on. We might want to coordinate so they do not go out to put on road restrictions and then again two days later to put up the ATV signs.

CB - Re enforcement - It's a big county - add without signage, maps, knowledge - I don't know if a law enforcement officer would even want to enforce or say that they are still breaking the law. As an enforcement officer, I'd want to be sure the info was available. Also need to check state law on what the law is for vehicles to leave the road. I am concerned about this.

MW (?) - We can enforce any state ordinance on county, doesn't mater if USFS...we just need to know which statutes and codes apply. Do we need county code listed on the website if we can identify the RCW? Either can be applied. Simply an off road statute.

Officer - I think other statutes could apply to no off-road usage.

JD - Closed hearing to written comment. Hearing continued to March 25, 1:30.

Capital facilities, Resolution for ballot

Chief Warden (MW) - We have worked on getting a work plan to put on the ballot. Constrains with agencies quite possible. Fires, EMS, Law enforcements sales tax revenue for systems improvement. Issues of trust probably the most important - to demonstrate that the county supports the effort and the plan. Are they dedicated or can they e re-routed? So far, very positive on agency side.

AH - praises the resolution.

LJ - can have it ready for signature by the end of tomorrow.

AH - I thought of a question a 1/10 of percent, but you go into the 2% portion....Wouldn't we want to go out for the tenth of a percent anyway? Agreed. He re-words, addressing the possibility of going higher later. All agreed to do the change. 1/10th now, or 2/10 if possible.

Chief Warden - Wants fire chief meeting later in March for work plan, etc.

PH - I will do language tonight.

AH - Do we want to go for 1/10 of percent no matter what? *Ph will improve language.*

**Update: WRIA 49 (Water Resource Inventory Area #49, Okanogan basin)
Next meeting is March 7.**

Huston: Funding Agreement for WRIA 49. Resolution - it calls for PH's signature instead of chair of the board. This is an offshoot of how the Eagle system works. Huston will get this resolved.

Phone system - PH - lack of familiarity as to how to run the system has been a problem. Think we have figured out how to do it.

CB - Even without mics that go out to the people at the table....they don't work well.

PH - There are mics you can "cater about", and can put it through the PA system. It would take up to 10 folks. If this works, it may be solution. The bulk of the heavy lifting will be in 2019.

That's your update on WRIA 49. We can reach back in time to reach some funding we can capture.

AH - On capturing those expenses...

PH - We identify staff time, the hard cost from mailings, etc.... the bulk will be staff time. Initiating gov's may bill travel time, etc. Whether we initiate with initiating gov'ts or planning unit is up for discussion. The agreement doesn't say if we can bill for travel time. In VSP we could not. Do not see it in this agreement, so it will be up to initiating gov'ts - and you, if the funding is allowed. I will check with Vanessa as to other agreements.

(LJ seems to be gone for most of this update.)

Capital Facilities: Juvenile Facility, Facilities Tax

PH: Dennis Rabidou came in about facilities tax. Under your pac planning schedule, Dennis is putting together a work program, which will lead to space needs analysis, which will lead to work flow chart. We can do this in-house.

1) How much can he spin off work last time? 2) Then we would start a new sheet of paper, through 2019. 3) Then in 2020, will build in a proposal that we move to design.

My opinion is that Dennis will ask for new facility rather than remodel. If you put a lot of \$\$ into remodel under the banner of doing something new, you create our own criticism within a couple of years. In order to do the best work program for kids in Okanogan county, do we need a few facility, or should we remodel the old one? That will be the first steps. Denis will update me on #1,2,3.

JD - Scot Hussle (?) their concerns are this new legislation where they are backing off on (???) for juveniles. Could have a huge effect upon our population.

CB - Agrees that there are changes afoot.

AH - We have a funding source, which puts us at an advantage. We may have something that other counties could use, and utilize that.

CB - In a larger context, this could be a consideration. Not that many entities such as Martin Hall may want to be in it.

Tonasket Issues:

PH Tonasket vouchers, none today. Did send out purchasing policies. Met up with JT last week. Asked him to create amendment comments.

Lake management Dist 1:

No money until collections in April. Received bill from Treasurer's Office which we cannot pay at this time. Just so you know. Will work it out with treasurer.

**Cannabis Public Hearing: OCC 17A.290 Cannabis Operations
OCC 17A.220 (District Use Chart)**

3:00: PH - Summary: You are currently under interim controls. Differences with the above Ordinances:

*Lighting - now must be downcast and shielded.

*Planning Commission recommended a 5 A minimum lot size for Cannabis growing to be allowed.

*In District Use chart now alphabetical under cannabis.

*Under interim controls: It is now R-1 - CUP (Conditional Use Permit)

* Methow Review District - same as before.

Summary of the below: The conversation went on for a long time as to what difference it makes to require a 5-acre lot minimum and whether those without a 5 acre lot are legal.:

AH - if permitted in R-1 but minimum lots size is 5 acres, if my underlying zoning is 1 acre but current zoning is 5 acres and I get a production facility permitted but only use 1 acre, how does this work?

PH - You would need to shut down. I review it for subdivision, that issue would be flagged and one of the conditions would be the cannabis (inaudible) ...of not an existing operation.

AH -clarifies that such an operation would not “exist” to just “be sited.” It has to be dealt with by approval of subdivision.

CB - You would be creating a zoning violation by siting it.

PH -yes.

AH - How about multiple facilities on a 5 acre?

PH - if owner..may not be the operator...it is still a requirement of the landowner.

AH - You could have 7 or 3 operations on 5 acres?

PH - Whether one or 50, you have to have a least 5 acres. Depends upon where you situate on 5 acres. You have to have at least 5 acres to have a production . Planning Commission also discussed a limitation on how much you could put....did to make a recommendation - no ceiling on how much you could put somewhere. Water will be a limitation. Planning Commission did not at this point recommend a ceiling of how many operations could be on 1 parcel.

Advisory committee: looked at how to create a separation, or how to minimize impacts on a neighborhood. They came up with 5 A minimum, no setbacks, setbacks in terms of high density - looking at all these things in total, they felt it would be a reasonable effort toward minimizing impacts. It would be Administrative Review by Perry and his staff. Looking at sizes of lots will be part of this.

Cannabis vs. Industrial Hemp - Discussion

JD - How about the 10-mile set-back from hemp (for Cannabis)?

PH - PC did not get into industrial hemp except that BOCC should revisit it. There are current regs for industrial hemp. Re cross - pollination, the non industry folks said many of the impacts

of cannabis would be same with hemp, especially the smell. Re cross-pollination, the industrial hemp picks up too much THC and then the cannabis has too little. This was of concern.

AH - Since Cannabis is in the farm bill and recognized as an agricultural crop, could we dictate where they grow it?

PH - Because you are a right to farm county, does not mean that you cannot govern activities. In the near future, airport safety zones will regulate agricultural products in terms of attracting birds, etc. Feed lots, dairy centers under agriculture are regulated. Right to farm rule simply puts in a safe harbor clause. If you are conducting agricultural activities according to standards, you are safe against nuisance litigation. Re applying pesticides...if you are adhering to regs that govern, according to right to farm there cannot be action against it.. It could be struck down, but merely because it's agriculture does not mean you can't regulate.

CB - At some time, that will drive us to residential zoning where it does not apply - because residents will be resistant to it. Airports given as example.

JD - thinks Planning Commission was not aware of some of this.

PH - They didn't think they had enough info as to differences between Cannabis and industrial hemp

JD - Should we talk about his?

PH - You are on interim controls...we need a public hearing as to whether anything should be extended or amended.

AH -wants voting record of Planning Commission.

PH - 4 yes, one no, 2 absent.

Reservation Boundary/Intergovernmental Agreements in re Industrial Hemp

JD - I just think there should be further discussion. I am seeing problems we won't be able to do anything about. One is the reservation boundary.

AH - Did we close public testimony?

PH - This is the first hearing on this one. Re reservation : It is by intergovernmental agreement We can say Conditional Use Permit. But that presupposes they come to us for permitting. If they go to tribe, if tribal member or trust or allotment land, they will process their own permits per intergovernmental agreement *.(Adds other details.)*

CB - Could be tribes that are actually growing it.

PH - Tribes may have some things on the ground by now. Have not communicated. Certainly something you can revisit.

CB - This amendment was circulated to the tribes?

P - Yes. We received a call previously -from range manager of tribe concerned with how regulatory approach to industrial hemp there was some concern.

3:30 - PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kelsey Taylor: About the 5 acres - You can't fit 7 growers on this. You need room to move tractors, etc. Probably could fit about 2 on there. Main thing - On industrial Hemp, important to be judicious. A number of bills are out there at the state level - we do not have to go back to the drawing board on what we worked on for 1 1/2 years. Can work now on how we can mitigate. We can do sometime to help. Important to finish this so people know where they can operate, the District Use Chart, and give us time to talk with communities about hemp.

Andrews Taylor - We are south of Mallot. Want to speak about hemp. int can often happen in legislation is to be able to create rules when you are trying to do a lot to do on package. Happy we have Cannabis Adv. Committee to come to some agreement. One concern - if this goes back to a (delivery?) committee - it might be really challenging to get together for a solution. Each of the hemp endeavors has different problems. It was astonishing that the Adv. Committee came to in re the rules, especially with challenging zoning. Urge that we pass this agreement, and we can come together again and speak to hemp - much more likely to come to agreement if we take each one separately; especially considering the zoning map we have. Having two issues can compound the issue.

Matt Friggioni - On Wolf Creek. Member of Cannabis Adv. group - we did a lot of work. We came up with reasonable regulations on most issues as to how to locate. Would like to have you move forward so we can see some results. Later, can have conversation on hemp. Want to see that move forward and then have conversation on hemp. Don't want to throw out a 100 million dollars now for something that will (??) There are a lot of different hemp crops with varying needs, varying economic benefit. A lot of dialogue needs to done. But for now, want to see our work move forward.

Stew Skidmore -- Resident of Munding Lane, within 1/4 miles of an operation. Have 6 approved grow operations on my road. There are a number of important issues:

- 1. Fences & wind:** Not too uncommon. I am an official NOAA weather observer (shows image of what was done to 4 of the 6 grow operations recently during wind storm to fences. Engh Road- completely knocked down. East portion compromised. Across 97 by gun club - numerous sections of fence knocked down, still down. On bluff above - large dumpster of grow cloth - now all over fences and sagebrush. Another one - 2 sides knocked down. Another one - fence tattered since put up 3 year ago. The current fencing ordinance is not sufficient. Why do we have one?? Safety of grow, or to obscure from public? It needs to

handle winds in excess of 60 mph before being destroyed. In Aeneas, almost all the fences have gone down. 40 mph gusts not uncommon.

2. **Odor** - presumed that outdoor grow operations need the odors - the odor is highly offensive. Like a pack of skunks. Lasts for 3 months. You can't get away from it. Affects your property value.
3. **Hemp production** - 314 square miles (?) around each grow. It is a viable opportunity to wheat growers. The only option now is canola. Production of hemp would allow another alternative. Tremendous number of users. More viable than cannabis.
4. **Living close to cannabis operation:** There is nothing valuable about this. No one wants to live next to a grow operation. If county continues grows to be in suburban type areas.... We had problems 3 years ago. Where I am, there are probably 3- 400 people who will be affected by them.

Public Testimony finished - 3:45.

Cannabis vs Industrial Hemp

TH - In a cannabis THC vs hemp plant, what is the actual thing that stinks.

Matt F. - It is a "tropine." Same thing you smell in nature, in everything. Hydrocarbon smell all present in nature. every smell in nature is a tropine. A light hydro carbon - evaporates at (??) temp or lower. Cannabis v hemp - no difference. Subtle differences. Different strains have varying degrees, and some smell more or less.

AH - So we are not talking about 70% difference?

MF - Possible but not likely.

AH - Leery about changing this right now, especially if they smell the same. Had person testify that you could only fit 2-3 activities on 5 acre parcel. So maybe we can say we can only put 2-3 activities on 5 acres? Otherwise, I would put 2 together on 10 acres to fit in more.

CB - If you have a 5-A parcel...as an individual and a multi-multi-farmed entity, is there a limitation.....???

PH - At this point, no regulation as to 1,2,3 "Tier 3's." "MOSTLY applicable if you are leasing. nothing in your regulation that prevents that except setbacks from lot lines.

CB - Concern - Is there some advantage to having multiple grows? If there are, should sheds be considered. Concerned about winds, sheet metal, etc. That fence was from the state, right?

PH - Yes. You have in your regs now a requirement for certain types of fencing.

AH - Could create a code for various types of fencing.

CB - Lighting is one that I have always felt should be county-wide.

Things like fencing should be elsewhere. I want to address some of this now. So a question I have - the rules that are being proposed now - a number of operations because there were no regs from the get-go. If yo apply these things to existing circumstances...real curious as to how staff feels about that - do we have the ability to

PH - Cites things in our current regs or suggested regs - looking at CUP expanding an operation, under current operation probably wouldn't be cited. Other operations are a lot smaller than 5 acres. Had this reg been in place in 2013, some of the operations now, and focus, wouldn't exist.

Omak Growing Operation

CB - So a recent development I'm getting comments on because it is under existing rules - a specific one - is in Omak.

PH - The one north of Omak is going in under your interim regulations, the last batch. Would have been able to go in.

CB - That is in R-1.

PH - Yes.

CB - Near city expansion area?

PH - Yes. Omak said they had no issues with it.

What Is the Use of Having 5 Acre Minimums?

AH - if I have a lot and want to keep building, is there an issue of canopy? (Impervious surface.) Scenario - Presented to Planning Commission, who said 5 acre minimums. But there is no difference if they have a whole bunch of 1 acres.

PH - To understand context - this came up under banner of separation - more distance between you and your neighbor. You can butt up against one side. They also discussed that the size of the operation is important in re odors. Planning Commission - in their discussion did not come to an agreement.....what it would come down to is how much canopy on any given parcel. Did not make a recommendation, but had the discussion.

AH - So they left it for us (*shaking head.*)

CB - If 5 acre minimum, there IS a limitation to the size of the operation.

AH - You can buy continuous operation for 5, 10, 20 acres. No limitation on the number of licenses.

CB - If I have a 5-A operation, what you are saying is that I can put another 5 acre operation next to it.

AH - I can get efficient at space...in this there is no number of licenses that are a maximum, or canopy max. You could fill everything.

Problems with our Current Zoning Regarding Incompatible Uses

CB - That's why the zoning doesn't work in what we are doing. If residential zone, you can (*approve?*) agricultural uses, and it will be an agricultural area.

AH - Maybe we should go to - if it is zoned R-5 or less, you have maximum canopy amount. They went to 5 acres but did it to restrict the (?) on 5 acres.

CB - More important to me, is that you can have a sequence of 5 acres.

AH - But if I have a percentage canopy, and they are maxed out at 60,000 sq ft.....

CB - Because of the zoning districts, here is nothing in there thatI could have lots of residences in a row.....

AH - But if a lot of them are taken up already, you can't put unlimited more operations.
from line 968: discussed that it doesn't limit

Odor issue - Approach is separation

CB - Include, to base decisions on whether we consider odor an issue or not. This methodology deals with lot density, not odor issue.

JD - With odor, it's a pandora's box. Some do not like smell of apple spray, feed lots, calving area. Very difficult to deal withbaby's breath..... almost everything we do has an odor-related issue.

PH - Odor was one of the lynchpins of the advisory committee. The approach was to minimize not the odor, but the number of people affected by the odor. This was the approach that was fairly consistently applied.

JD - Where I live - I am asthmatic. We have extensive sagebrush and bitter brush. But I like mule deer. There are circumstances to every issue. Do not know how we can come to a conclusion.

Cb - I don't want it to be...folks get the idea we are addressing the odor by any of these density issues.....and when It comes to traffic, etc - it does not lend itself to patrolling that. If we have

bushes of plowed uses in those areas....it is a difficult piece of work because of that fact. We need acknowledge that all the way through this.

AH - I still have not heard from any what the thought was about the 5 acres. If we cannot govern the amount of cannabis on 5 acres, why do this?

PH - In existing reg, you can put to any legal lot, 1 acre or 2....one of the problems until 2016, vast area outside Methow Review District was in Minimum Requirement Dist that zoning had resulted in so many lots sizes and uses scattered around county. Growers used land they owned or land they could use.

Also based on understanding that theoretically, should the licensing requirements, all of this - sort of defacto, not stated restrictions...about how much you can (?create?)) on 5 Acres? The feeling was not to control the size, but a greater level of separation.

It is presupposed that the owner wants to lease. he is probably not a producer. The discussion is and was that by creating a larger lot size, you are creating a higher level of separation from neighbors.

Ah -Licensing???

PH & audience - With state, there are minimum separations, fences, between operations.

CB - I don't like it , but there isn't much I can do about it now. Given the zoning we have now, it is difficult to say....in a lot of areas...I have a 1-acre lot, and everything else is..... Just the limitation of 5 acres helps.

JD - I agree. zoning goes across so any different mixes of uses ...trying to sort it all out is a constant problem. But if we said you can only grow it in Horse Spring Coulee..neighbors come complaining he is a multi-million dollars millionaire.

CB - If you are on district use chart most of what you see in Okanogan Valleyand we are dealing with lot size...

PH - Your rezoning is still centered around residential zoning and how dense....for example light industrial is permitted in 3 zoning areas. Still focused on the size of parcel you can build a house upon. Advisory Committee - wrestled with whether to make zones for hemp or Cannabis. They finally walked away from that (identifying areas where Cannabis would be more appropriate.) It was overly daunting. That's why they took the overlay approach.

CB - If we have gravel pits, kennels, etc. by CUP - every one of those uses has its challenges when it goes to permits, and people will not like it. We should keep his in mind when we are allowing other uses that can be as invasive into residential areas. Some are permitted outright. Cannabis is not the only issue we are going to deal with.... In the end , we will have the same things the come up to every operation. If it is a CUP , there is some chance of dealing with the issues. At old Crown Zellerbach mill there was a smell.... We need to think about this - odor,

lighting, etc....across the county. I am at a point that we should go forward and address our zoning. other wise, we will keep having to address these issues. And some of that is moral values of people.

Branch moves to make this a permanent ordinance.

Discussion:

AH - will not work for me on the thought about how much could be grown on a 5 A parcel . I'm having hard time with that.

CB - If I can put a 5-Acre marijuana parcel on any parcel, what difference does it make?

AH - Talks about creative spacing to create 6 different licensees.....

CB - If I can't do that and I am in a district where I can't grow Cannabis.....

AH - yes....You have spread it across the landscape.

Advisory Committee member Kelsey Taylor is willing to share perspective. She defers to Paul M.

Paul M: 25 foot backup all the way around required. Looking at 5-A parcel, you use a lot of feet. Already lost 1 acre. If you have 2, ..

AH - Asks if setback is 25 around property, 20 between fencelines....YES.

(Group adds up storage area, footprints of various things. Finally come up with the math to show usability area for 3 or so maximum farms on 5 acres - they go back to screen on setbacks)

JD - I don't want to get into situation where someone will litigate because it's a rolling moratorium.

PH - It is interim control. (Goes on about all of their options.)

CB - To make the difference a little (?bigger?), interim regs are adopted on accelerated basis. If we are permanent, we just satisfied that part - we adopt so no one else can get here and make another mistake. Wait a minute. We can see a problem. We don't want anyone vested in atoner one of htse. If we adopt today, JD - the is my point, and I agree with you. We are not going to solves all these problems...it will be baby steps. Poor operators will weed themselves out. Good operators will stay.

C.B. Motion approved, needs for future work on Comp Plan/Zoning

CB - We should actually, in Comp Plan, look at use designation and create zones that have more limited uses, and it goes further nearer residential centers. Get a handle on comprehensive plan. We can find areas for some uses...uses that are more compatible with each others. We should head this way.

JD - You are right, as Mr. Skidmore said earlier, in re the *fencing*.

AH - We can address that through zoning code.

PH - Do I prepare a enabling ordinance?

CB - It is one step better than the interim ordinance. I would like to see some items of interim addressed. I think we should discuss lighting around the county.

PH - Brings up that lighting and night skies were brought up under Comp Plan scoping.

PH - Wil prepare ordinance.

JD - Closes public hearing.

Discussion: Long Range Planning Position?— Will Huston hire one? (Talk about apparently sharing with Oroville.)

(Note: due to noise of public leaving hearing, it was difficult to determine the context. Notetaker believes it relates to the new Primitive Roads study, being initiated through the Okanogan Council of Governments.)

PH - If OCOG moving ahead with project, it will be another dimension than if we had done it in-house.. Regardless , we still have to incorporate into our regulations, etc. I don't know if a consultant would be tasked to do that - someone on our staff will have to do this.

CB - When I left Oroville - honestly, I was doing some of your planning. The mayor has been asked if they were still interested.

PH - So the moral of the story is....

AH - Push a little on the back burner, but still keep it, if for some reason....

PH - I haven't followed up with anyone yet. Difficult if 49 work will be done. People in Planning are working pretty hard.

AH - Is there another position in planning?

AH - We are fully budgeted.

JD - Didn't we just do one (*a position in Planning*) 3 weeks ago? (*PH clarifies a position was filled.*)

CB - We were talking about using roads funds for some this.

PH - Josh and I are of the same mind in terms of the work that should be done. He is of the mind that some of that work should go under planning because of its nature, political overtones, etc. He is certainly not straying away from the work. The question is where ground zero will be...I agree it's partially part of planning, and eventually we will have to do it. Will some of it come from public works funding? Probably.

CB - This is North County work...

PH - So I will continue ...

End