

Okanogan County Board of Commissioners
2/12/18

Jim DeTro - (JD) BOCC
Andy Hover - (AH) BOCC
Chris Branch - (CB) BOCC
Perry Huston - (PH) Director of Planning and Development and Administrative Officer
Lanie Johns (LJ) - County Clerk
Angie Hubbard (AH) - County Planner
Jeremy Moberg and others - Cannabis Advisory Committee

These notes have been taken by one of several volunteer citizen note takers and published on the website of Okanogan County Watch (countywatch.org) The notes have been taken as close to verbatim as possible but summarized when necessary. Any 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 of meeting:

Cannabis Advisory Committee: Huston summarizes work of Cannabis Advisory Committee. Public Hearing on Feb 26 at 1:30 - Purpose is to consider the Cannabis moratorium, expiring on March 5. There will be a number of options, including removal of the moratorium with interim controls, referral to the Planning Commission, and repeal of the moratorium without interim controls. Discussion includes enforcement officer, fencing, setbacks/visibility, odor, mitigations, industrial hemp, Colville reservation, licensing, medical marijuana.

Okanogan County Code Title 20: Public hearing Feb 26, 3 Pm. Repeal of Title 20 and adoption of Title 20 A as interim control. Detailed discussions included: BOCC questions as to water management in WRIA 48 & 49 now required by new State legislation; reasonability of outdoor watering ban for gardens and green space in a rural, fire-prone area; DOE Grant Application for funding to manage water issues; recall of WRIA watershed planning unit.

Comprehensive Plan: Designation of Resource Lands as Agricultural & Forest lands - Detailed discussion: "Viability" of Forest and Ag lands; "Coordination" as a tool for designation of both private and public lands; public health and safety. SEPA checklist now being prepared, to be followed by Determination of Significance and Scoping. Review of a "point system" used in Yakima County to designate Resource Lands supported by Branch but apparently vetoed by Huston.

Mt. Hull Restoration Area: Discussion of concerns re de-commissioning of roads by USFS, with Branch lobbying (unsuccessfully?) for an on-site visit.

1:30 PM - Cannabis Advisory Committee Report and Discussion

(Notetaker arrived at 1:23 and left briefly. Upon return at 1:27, an informal discussion was in progress.)

1:27 PM: 3 Gentlemen sitting at front table. A woman and two men join them.

The informal conversation relates to the potential for Okanogan County to be the largest producer in the state. Some discussion of various types of marijuana is underway.

1:32 PM - CB opens discussion officially. Other members of committee gradually enter.

Introduction of committee members: *Most names said to BOCC and too soft to hear from audience. However, member of this committee as listed elsewhere by the county are: And Ervin, Don Gay, George Zittle, Jeremy Moberg, Keith Kistler, Linda Pierce, Matt Frigione, Paul Neir, and Brad Skelton. Names that could be heard: Jeremy Moberg, Matthew.*

Also present: At front table: Don Gray (investor for a firm in Bremerton who wants to move to Okanogan County.) In audience: Mr. Swarensen (in audience.)

PH: Intro to work product: District Use chart included in your info. Hearing on Feb 26 1:30 - Purpose is to consider the moratorium, which expires March 5. These will be options (*from chart facing away from audience. Did my best to get it correct.*)

- *Repeal moratorium
- *Adopt interim controls
- *Transmit to Planning Commission

- *Extend moratorium.
- *Submit to Planning Commission for review

*Extend moratorium and re-submit to CAC (*Cannabis Advisory Committee*) for further work

- *Repeal moratorium
- *No interim controls

PH: This group one of the most effective advisory groups.

Impacts: A decision was made that instead of minimizing impact, minimize the number of people who are affected by impacts.

- *operations not in high density areas
- *create an overlay
- *use definition - lot size and (???)

It has been agreed:

- *Not siting in high density areas is a good idea
- *Pulling fences off property lines a good idea.

Existing question: in terms of vesting - would it bring currently best sites in?

Important: Light shielding, fencing, parking

- *Moving out of existing size not recommended
- *Outdoor grows are the ones that are creating the biggest impacts.

Things dealt with “differently”:

High density areas

City expansion areas - high density, but city already has rules. Conditional use permit would be best for these operations as already adopted.

We don't have anything in the adopted in Comp Plan, but this time around we would want to do it. Probably not too many changes before hearing.

CANNABIS ADVISORY GROUP COMMENT AND DISCUSSION

*Question from audience, possibly a member of the committee: Is there appointment of code enforcement officer in Ok county?

AH - How long have you lived here?

Response: Off and on in last 30 years. I headed up some effort in District 3 re cannabis. We had public hearings, we answered questions....

A man on committee asks what they are talking about.

AH - The fact that someone said there would be "a buried body, whatever." (*In relation to code enforcement officer*)

PH - Code enforcement is not a popular approach in our county.

Man - All we can do as a team is recommend.

Another person - said AH's father was there (*Bud Hover, previous Commissioner.*) We know the flip side of lack of code enforcement.

AH - We will need some sort of a hybrid.

JD - Do you as an industry want to provide some kind of financial assistance to provide code enforcement?

CB - During that period of time, in Dist 3, marijuana was being produced already. The idea of people to enter just for code compliance would be a big difference. That may have been one of the issues. Also, when you decide there will be an enforcement issue and over decades there is no enforcement, you will wind up with problems all over. Also, anyone who is labeled as a code enforcement officer should get paid on the level of judges, because they are taking on so many dangerous issues. A whole lot of established non-conforming uses you will need to deal with, which requires some sort of a schedule. Received a letter from someone who has a huge lien on their property because of non-compliance on sewage system. But everyone in the neighborhood was doing the same thing. But I agree, some of these issues could have been solved with some enforcement.

AH - Needs to be some sort of understanding re "they are doing it wrong." Others in the industry want the process because they could get a bad name.

PH - You will not see a proposal in this. That's another track. I am hopeful that at the hearing we do not go too far into code enforcement because we need to drill into other issues.

JD - To a certain extent, the state has an enforcement officer, but spread too thin.

PH - He visited me earlier today. Believes becoming more involved in the permit application....
(*No one at the table appears to be using mics, including PH. Could not hear end of sentence.*)

PH to BOCC: Part of your charts -1) trying to minimize impact to neighbors 2) Trying to make things clear to the industry. By identifying areas where they should not go, we have identified areas where they have a better chance of success. With regulations, we can minimize the impact. Conditional Use on district use chart (see it.)

Industrial hemp : Some agreement that hemp vs cannabis - still of the same “block” as far as impact is concerned. Lots of challenges. In district Use chart, out of recognition of Colville issues - industrial hemp areas do not allow marijuana. Leaves industrial help in the Minimum Requirement District.

JD - Is everyone on the board aware that there are quite a few proponents on the tribe - very interested in industrial hemp . But because they are a sovereign nation, we cannot tell them that they cannot grow industrial hemp.

PH - If someone on fee simple or (?) applies to us for industrial hemp; - if they apply to tribe, they will notify us. They will go through Colville planning. This proposal recognizes all of these things.

AH - We don't have projector with apps....so unincorporated counts?

PH These are neighborhood commercial operations.

Indoor production, process facilities - AH trying to figure all this out.

PH - Looks a district use chart (*not visible to audience.*)

PH - We are not looking for anything today unless you have questions or observations. At public hearing, different options discussed.Group meets again on the 21st. Will get memo summarizing work before then.

AH - Group's intent as to indoor grows?

*PH - Within 1,000 ft are to provide (?? mitigations)

AH - I see where you came down...were talking about citing of ability in proximity to recreation center, etc. - you have 100 feet.

PH - These related to outdoor grows. Indoor grows are inside. In case of processing or indoor grow, requires to have odor mitigations and signage requirements.

AH - What if the side of building is glass...If you have windows on it...you have a child care center, cited within 100 feet....some confusion....against state law?

PH - Visual impacts on indoor grow? Has to be inside structure. If you can see inside from the sidewalk or public domain, you have to make the windows opaque.

AH - Indoor growth or production must be 100 feet from recreation center, child care, public park, library, etc etc.

DeTro - Calls intermission to deal with signing off on another project.

AH - Doesn't want kids walking by an indoor grow and looking through windows.

Jeremy - It allows the county to adopt this.

AH- right now, if we approved an indoor grow with glass windows, what is the requirement for seeing in..etc? If on public sidewalk and can see in, it must be opaque. He wants this added.

PH - Idea of distinguishing between indoor grow and othersAll seem to agree to adding this to recommendations.

JD - Industrial hemp - must be located 10 miles from nearest existing production. Asks Jeremy - where you are located. if you go direct line from the county to fish hatchery reclamation thing in Riverside - a lot of property along river that is river bottom. What if the reservation decides to locate there?

Jeremy - We bump up against the topics of the tribes.

PH - assuming you adopt all this and Colville doesn't recognize our codes (doesn't happen much) probably have to permit it anyway. Discussion amongst group - desire to prove cannabis industry - the impacts are going to be (????), smells, etc. Unless you change from recommendationsrecognizes the "rind" around reservation is there

Jeremy - Compacts may be able to be dealt with at that level. But Colvilles have already signed their compact.. Some allow tribes to grow as much as they want and to sell within the 502 area. Why are we giving them this much access to our markets?...but not addressable at this level.

PH - Commissioners? Questions? This is just your introduction.

AH - Would like a better map. Knows that zoning would kind of be points, jags, etc.

PH - Keep in mind, the high density areas we have yet to be identified and mapped. Ie - if someone wants a grow in Crumbacher, can't do it - like Twin Lakes. We created a definition instead of making an overlay.

Jeremy - There is a decent judicial decision in Kittitas that sided with the county against the LCB when in improperly zoned areas. LCB will not longer be able to issue licenses like this. They do not believe in banned areas. Now the LCB should not issue licenses in areas we have decided.

AH - License fee?

Jeremy - \$1,300 per year to maintain license. Can no longer play. No more application process. But they can be moved or cited. Would not allow movement into the wrong area is the theory.

Woman on committee - This is probably why you have seen more interested in an enforcement officer.

Jeremy - LCB is being sued over this. They are giving licenses in "banned" areas. State has to make some decisions.

AH - But it's allowing only transfer of a license (or renewal, which has to be every year.)

AH - But the county can never have that renewal money. We only get \$12,000 per year.

Jeremy - law was flawed because it based return on retail consumption. Really screwy and needed to be fixed. We are trying to work out different dispersion of funds to recognize county needs. Counties that do not have a lot of retail space are getting nothing.

PH - Meeting again on the 21st. You will get more docs before public hearing.

JD - Curious. All rumor, but they say that the recreational commercial and medical marijuana community do not see eye to eye. But can't retail businesses sell both these products?

* Yes. If you register as a medical user, save tax. Medical - can come in to find, get a recommendation from a doctor. You can buy sales tax free, not excise tax free. And must give all info to the LCB and/or invite the LCB onto their property. Not that great a savings. A lot of extra testing requirements make it not really financially better. But all can be under the same roof.

CB - If verified medically, can you carry a gun? No. A lot of laws will then apply.

CB - Case in Kittitas was a growth management case.

PH - Parallel language in the PEA (*Planning Enabling Act, which governs OK Cty rather than Growth Management Act.*) Requires state agencies to comply with local plans. Not entirely clear.

CB - pointed out several times in the case that it was GMA applicable. Needs to be checked out.

AH - So we talked about the setback from county road. It does say county road. How about from state highways?

PH - Usually the right of way from state highway is generally enough separation. We can take under advisement.

AH - Just look at it. Impairing vision, etc. Can be an issue.

PH - On state route, still a 25 foot setback. The group came up with larger setback for county roads. We can look at it.

AH - Supposed to get a building permit for anything over 6? 8? feet .

Jeremy - this came up. We thought 8 ft should be under building permit. We came up with offset because you didn't need a building permit for a fence. (*There are disagreements about requirements.*)

AH - Under construction of a home, building permit, this is sort where it falls? Will it be glowing all over? Dangerous? Blocking site line?

Jere, - Even if building permit we don't want advertisements (?)

PH - New 290 balks about building materials.

PH - Security fences are now moved back. Will see if anything relates to lot line setbacks.

AH - How many miles of outdoor grow fences are there?

PH - will check more into all this. Fences are allowed in property line. But we are moving security fences back.

Jeremy - Not in favor of this personally.

Branch to group - Do you feel good about how far you have come? They agree - he thanks them for their work. They all chat about good aspects of having the committee. Talk about give and take that had to happen, industry having been brought together.

PH - Challenge of the WAC - sites where conditions don't exactly exist. If you do all these requirements, it presumes you are causing no harm.

Branch - WAC puts county in odd position.

PH - Group tried to minimize odor for everyone, but it was impossible. The goal is to minimize the number of people impacted. Looked at rules for feed lots.

CB - Down in basin - silage, etc moves all over in trucks.

PH - Operation up the hill brought in some kind of fertilizer, Pungent stuff. Permeated into your pores.

AH - Will we be moving on ? It's 2:26.

Group member - we went around and around about mitigation for odors - really non-mitigable. Could have talked extensively.

JD - County has had, at one time - a baby's breath operation - was commercial. When it grew wild, before any type of commercial use, at certain times of the year it was really pungent. Coming back to the policing, etc and referencing to unification. People may need to do self-policing. We found that with the ATV industry. Not trying to speak for sheriff - we know law enforcement is busy enough than to track down a 4-wheeler on the wrong side of road - get folks trying to do their own enforcement.

Man - are they independent?

JD - Yes, but they let us know what's going on.

JD - If they see someone non-complying, they speak with them.

CB - Someone could go to neighboring marijuana farm and tell them they are having an impact upon the neighborhood.

Jeremy - at some level, every problem must be investigated.

Jeremy - Thanks to Kelsey and Paul for doing a lot of the drafting.

2:30 - Cannabis finally ends.

Side conversation regarding keeping smoke jump base about location of having a meeting. Whether it should be at the jump base or not and who should set the place. Jump base good but not our property. Brainstorming : Winthrop Barn, Twisp Works. Meeting is Feb 24th at 2:00. Discussed wording of a communication - "Considering Winthrop barn unless other facilities seem more appropriate." *(They are wondering if the USFS might offer NCSB as an option for meeting site.)*

2:36 - Perry Huston: Okanogan County Code Title 20

This has been a total bed of activity for last week. I have set a public hearing for Feb 26, 3 Pm. Advertised as repeal of Title 20. He created Title 20 A which would be adopted as interim control If for no other reason than for references, notification processes, timelines, etc.

AH - You think we should adopt interim controls immediately?

PH - That is my suggestion. The 20A is pretty bread and butter stuff. We were criticized as to some of the language which would appear to have raised other sections - this has been pulled back. Very simple. 3670B type thing.

Nothing urgent about it, but to pull this off the books . we will at least be consistent in our approach. We can amend 20A if needed. In the interim, WDOE is not reading the same as I am (re new State legislation.)

AH - If you look up the PUD from my (*Dad?*) DOE gave him a letter that referenced the 2cfs...I think this is kind of what they are looking for. We were talking about existing wells just having their (*range there diminished?*) ...to an extent they are, but the only other piece was how are we tracking them against the 2 cfs?

PH - A lot of them in the early 90's, a lot of PD's - DOE would say voluntary relinquishment - part of an irrigation right - they didn't convert a water right to cover the permit exempt well. AH - read that letter - it specifically spells it out. There has to be some sort of paperwork that goes along with a well that says you are in such and such a reach, and you are subject to the 2 cfs.

PH John Hayes did a lot of this back int the day. All the wording is very similar. Said they were giving up a water right and mitigating the fact that you were pulling out of the 2 cfs. (?)

PH - Will look at this and then another one John Kirk figured out. Still begs the question how much you count per faucet per house.

PH - One of the things we talked about: If you want to adopt a water code , 14, or 18 might work. One of the things we could entertain, aside from interim in 49, etc. and a few things in terms of our approach to 48 . More than anything else is if we want to build into a local water code what we think every house uses.

AH - I think we will have to. No matter which WRIA- what are they talking about re water use? Not 45,000.

PH - My understanding - we are restricted for domestic use and stock against the 2 cfs

AH - Until the point where there is some definition.....

CB - It is against the cfs, but it isn't get...

PH - Let's get back on track.

*Ant that comes into house - 350 gal per day. Aspect said 210. 710 was the big number if you had outdoor watering.

*Recharge question: Still think in 48, no permit exempt well can do watering.

Some talk about combining domestic and outdoor watering. ...no one sure.

Adopt a local code - we can adopt our own standards, subject to review, etc. etc. At least we would have something to base our interpretation upon.

CB - Ludicrous to think you can't water outdoor, where we have to account for fire, etc. I don't think the legislature would be thinking that without being considered by some of our legislators. If you take those parts of land and don't put a little green about it, you are in trouble.

PH - Will need to deal with DOE on this. We still haven't had determinations of the water we have left in 48 - what could be permitted on an interruptible basis. Example in 48 - went ahead and approved permit exempt well, but not against 2 cfs...in our discussion with DOE, because that was an additional appropriationif they have to do this, or we can do it. (*Unclear meaning to note taker.*)

AH - Permit exempt domestic well in Wa state. Feb, 2015 - at the bottom, p. iii(1) domestic water use includes indoor use and MAY include lawn, garden, and washing cars. (*Unclear what he's reading from.*)

PH - This violates AG opinion and fair (?) of use law. Debated and litigated, etc. DOE seems to be trying to squeeze outdoor water....

AH - Compelling that we can say they have defined it in a paper. Goes into the consumptive use, a whole bunch of stuff in here. How many wells that have been drilled? Compelling enough to me.

PH - We passed out a paper they disseminated through WSAC. Is it the same? No (Angie) In some respects, it's simpler. (*Rattles off some virtues, not sure anyone knows what they are talking about.*)

Reasonability of watering ban for gardens and green space in a Rural area:

AH - We may need to ask if the person will restrict themselves to not watering, whatever. almost like a blanket system.

PH - We could try that. As I understand, some of the mitigation___ have something like this. So much a day for indoor, or some much for indoor and outdoor.

CB - Exempt rights for rural uses that do not include watering your garden is absolutely...If this is going to be interpreted this way, we should go back to the legislature and see if this is what it meant....If they really think people would move to a rural area and not be allowed to water their garden....

PH - One might agree that some definitions might include outdoor watering. *...more speculation.*

CB - The argument about what goes back into ground and whether it is readily available and in same form as it went in is way too hard to figure out.

PH - in 48, relevant as to how much we debit against the 2 cfs. Some of the reaches are so far away from using that amt of water, it is just academic. If we want to tackle through local process code or....in 49....it is done for us.

CB - We'd want to make it pretty clear before we put out a code and tell the people here's your target. Shoot it. As much as we can get cleared up with the state first and know what we are writing.....

PH - I was suggesting...(*hard to understand*)

CB - Once we have a clear picture of our strategy, I'd like to see things cleared up first. Your idea of having a water code or way to deal with it is an ok idea, though. We might hit on something where the law is clear and the law is agreeing with us; you might hold that out for discussion.

DOE Grant Application for funding to manage water issues

PH - (*No response to Branch. Change of subject.*) We are trying to put together the number for a grant application. My crew is staying to figure out that if we brought in a staffer how long will they need to reconcile all this so we can get a good idea..we have 1400 well logs - how many are there? How many being used? This will be more important to 48 in short term. Go back to how much cfs is allowed. In 49... Bring them in for a year or two that's all they would be doing. Or hire someone from (Aspect?) I have concern - we just get a disc from them...how do we keep it up??

I already chatted with Craig Nelson - told him give me a number if you *were* to come in and facilitate the revising of the watershed plan...without facilitating and drafting (*confusing.*) He will give number.

Gene looking into permit tracking system numbers.

Then if DOE can write us a check.....

AH - Are we talking with assessor?

PH - Will, but not yet. Will have to do in terms of permit tracking stuff. Need to get Public Health, building, assessor, probably public works involved too. If we are going to spend \$\$ on software, may as well be something they can all use.

AH - On Terra Scan, you can get all kinds of data. Why couldn't we add some of this stuff there?

PH - Haven't called in other "players" yet. See what kind of refinement we can put to a grant proposal.

Recall of watershed planning unit for WRIA 49

CB - We are not that far along on recalling the (*watershed planning unit?*) for WRIA 49. Before we say who is still interested/ what group will look like, we will be tasked with appointments, looking into whether it is a balanced group.

Char has looked into the old membership group. Some people are still around. Some have already anticipated. They are contacting him whether he is going to do it, what the timeline is... We are working on that. Get the invitation on that. Get a letter from the Board, Covilles, Yakamas, to invite them in.

3:07 COMPEHENSIVE PLAN - Designation of Resource Lands as Agricultural & Forest lands - Discussion.

How can Agricultural and Forest lands be made "viable?"

Do we designate both private and public lands and use "coordination" as a tool?

PH - I sent yesterday a very marked up draft of Comprehensive Plan. Today, a cleaner copy. We are cherry picking around the various plans that were adopted and passed muster in other counties. Plagiarizing. To see if we can put together something that will work. Sanitizing, with some exception - I sent one from Yakima that used a point system in designating resources. Don't know that we would want to do that. They are on a site -specific basis. I left some of that in, to see if it's something you might want to do.

On draft I sent over earlier today - take a look at resource designation. 2012 - Designation criteria, then de - designation criteria - peeling off , then you are left with certain lands and blind to ownership. Mineral was an overlay, as we have done all along. Angie freshened up soil maps. As part of VSP they did crop maps. We are in pretty good shape to go through and start redoing the maps.

AH - Wouldn't biggest contribution to Ag land be irrigation?

PH - One of the criteria would be irrigation language. In order to be prime, needs water. Take initiation district map, etc etc. Water rights.. we have lots of stuff to put together in something to go out for public review.

CB - Prior to designating, it's important to know what you are going to do with it (*the land.*) If you don't know what you are going to do, you can't argue why you are designating or how.

PH - Criterion is to designate enough land to support the industry. Lewis county case spear- pointed that. Anything that can support Ag - isn't use law - you have to support current and future needs of the industry.

AH - Within the county? By definition, and looking like this, we start off with map, soil enough to grow crops, and we designate it Ag land, and then we find out that this is not enough to meet the needs of the industry. I'm a little ...understand your definition, but if serious on use of not having enough Ag land....running through scenarios -....I think we are addressing Chris's question. If we are on the cusp of having enough property to supply the needs of the industry in agriculture.....Do you designate something else?

PH - You apply your criteria, then you have something. If it's not enough, I guess that's all you can do - we only have so much land. We did have input from the Ag industry as to what they need for now and in future.

AH - Certain crops, or use general Ag?

CB - Needs to the industry and on....?

PH - Current and future production. (*No answer to AH question.*)

AH - People concerned about Ag land because they will never be able to change it (*the designation?*)

CB - Current and future use. if you call the existing production lands and say you designate those lands, the fact is that the industry can grow or it can shrink.

JD -Cites a past date.

AH - Cites past figures for alfalfa.

AH - What are we going to do if we say in Comp Plan we are designating Ag land, what are we going to do with....I want to say that Ag is important to Okanogan county, but if someone goes to court on it, could we offer other contingencies to save that Ag land?

CB - That was the message of the Farm Bureau..the guy said if we want to protect Ag, make it viable. If I designate all these Ag lands and make every effort to see that the land is made viable...We are having a conversation with growers to be sure they are viable (*cannabis*.) If I were to leave out “cannot convert at all” and say we will “Make every effort to keep these lands viable....”

AH - Wants considering people also (*without “taking.”*)

CB - If we lose Ag lands, it means there are other highest and best uses...easier to sell it, and then it's out of the Ag base forever. So we are trying to do as much to help young people get into Ag, to make sure they are (*owners?*) So we try to have incentives. Once we get to regulatory stage, would it be a good argument? There are lands that are marginally valuable, so they they were put in for grazing....all you could use. One controversial element was conservation easements.

AH - If I say we should designate timber lands on federal property. to me that says that Okanogan County thinks of this as a resource, and because there is no recreational land designation

PH - We created one (*recreational resource designation*) in the last iteration.

AH - Even if we go to the forest land, it means we have a healthy forest, a viable forest, that people can enjoy...if you were to attempt to make money on it you could.

CB - That is back to argument as to whether or not you designate public lands. If we want to make a point of that, why don't we look at public lands and coordination...form a group to talk about this. You are making point - if you designate public lands. I'm trying to keep this into the context where it makes sense - you do not have the authority to designate federal land....but we can do coordination.

AH - Any type of land that wouldn't be designated for anything?

PH - Under banner of planning, every ounce of land should bear some kind of designation. Once you have designated, the rest can be rural lands. We actually created a rural designation. You don't have to do that. If you take a pure bread and butter approach, the resource land designation from Comp Plan to zone code, you see large lots, you see clustering provisions where higher density can go in marginal areas leaving areas of land open. You don't cite incompatible uses. Your zoning supports agricultural activities. They may also be found elsewhere.

When you do the de-designation, you peel out things that don't mean much sense. ie: take out urban growth areas. Don't want large lots there. If you parallel that, you wouldn't put the Ag designation in the CEA (*UGA?*). If you already have 5 acres - if larger, large. if smaller, small.

Keep in mind, talking about resource designation. Just because you have pockets of large lots in other areas, doesn't mean it's resource. At the end of the day, you are supposed to have enough lands designated to meet the needs of the industry.

Where you usually find the public (*use?*) being prominent, probably forest land. One thing we talked about way back when - look at tax classification. This wasn't particularly popular, but the reality is that if

you have put your land into Forest classification or Ag classification, you have already put your land into this designation. We put it on the (?) and it wasn't that popular - but people choose to do these things.

CB - If you put forest into forest designation, but the USFS is not harvesting enough for the industry.

AH - But if you designate that way, maybe it will help at a sawmill.

CB - We have little control of that.....

PH - I'm not suggesting we only designate public lands. We apply criteria, whether publicly or private. Only reason we talked about federal land is under the banner of coordination.

CB - if you do designate public lands (forest) you designate private land too. This might start the conversation. Meeting needs of the industry means very little to me. You can find all kinds of ways, but it doesn't make much sense - a moving target.

AH - If we designate private property, I tend to go any other way except to designate every part of Okanogan county as some kid of resource. The conditions you are applying goes both ways.

CB - If you decide to designate forest lands, you qualify it for being your reason for doing that, and designate private lands as well.

AH - Yes - why designate Ag lands? Do everything you can to see it in production.

CB - Argument is solved by saying you are designating private land in addition to public lands. We give our reason and intent for designating it. So let's look at taking out the fear and putting in the positive aspect that we are looking at, making both Ag and forest lands viable. If you tie these together, the one thing you won't do is say I've designated forest lands and am then going to cut and run.

AH - Same thing with grazing cattle. If grazed property, they (*cattle*) enhance. I don't want people saying that if it's designated timber, I can't graze....

CB - agrees.

PH - Anomalous - When Planning Commission went through evaluation of zoning, while we had the resource designation pushed around here and there, when the PC actually looked at the zone map, they "orphaned" a lot of 5 acre land from 20's....illustrating philosophy more than anything else. If you are having 20 A lot requirement, considered big enough for Ag. If we can pin down resource designation based upon criteria rather than on things that don't make sense, you have a defensible position. When we get into zoning, we look at how that is scattered out.

You target is right here: the R-1 zoning across the landscape probably isn't practical.

CB - In Walla Walla, I saw a lot of 5 acres of land that looked like farms. Those were closer into the city at the fringes. They were onion farms, 5 or 10 acres.

AH - This says "we understand that Ag land will be converted to other uses."

PH - thinks that came out of the document. This is one of the things the legal team suggested be pulled out. ...they are looking at some drafts.

PH - Hubbard and I came up with a plan to make things more cohesive. Are you interested in going to some kind of site-specific system on resource lands? Yakima county came up with a list of things that got you points. If enough points, you went into resource designation....

CB - Let's take look at it.

PH - I don't think that's necessary. I prefer not to do it.... *(Note taker: Unclear whether the Planner is making this decision over Branch's directive as Commissioner or whether they will actually take a look at this in the future, per Branch's directive.)*

AH - Do you have an overlay that shows what land is covered by

Angie Hubbard says yes.

PH - We can put on overlays to see where they all intersect. Tricky part with that is a policy, even decision to make, because too the way crops are scattered out....for example in Oroville you wouldn't designate.....

AH - We should designate in city expansion areas because... do you want to let the city expand, or is it more important than keeping Ag inside this area so it stays as is?

PH - You will have most of county in a Resource designation....will need to say why you are not going to keep some of them int that designation (like you need room for city expansion.)

CB - After cities have already submitted plans, probably a good thing to discuss UGA's (*Urban Growth Areas*) with each city as to whether you leave certain lands in or out of urban growth areas. Realtors will tell you that you should never let some of these go.....

PH - Simply because in resource land designation, doesn't mean you can't keep Ag there.

CB - This is a progressive conversion.... we are defining it....the question is how we are going to use it.

AH You can't make Ag viable as a planner.

CB - Yes you can. Planners do not have to regulate. A planner can go with the people...I'm not going to write your plan...when you get to the point where you are saying we have looked at all these things, you can ask what can we do to make all this work? It's says to me, you want to have a mobile slaughter unit..if the county makes that a priority, we don't ONLY designate lands, etc....you can help make it viable.

PH - I have a more jaded approach. You can make it NOT viable.

CB - And we can do things to make it viable. Not just zoning. It does not have to work by just putting something into a certain zoning.

Public Health and Safety in Comp Plan

PH - Flooding, wildfire protection, etc. I am going to take the clean draft I sent you and mark it up.

CB - See items here in introductory section - Rejected? I think they work really well.

PH - In clean draft...

CB - Retaining land in Ag is preferred use in Ag areas? It doesn't mean just that.

PH - I think I have the next step . I will mark up this clean draft and send back to you.

MT HULL RESTORATION AREA

AH - (to DeTro) You were not here when Forest Health Collaborative came - they were talking about decommissioning roads. His thought was that there has to be some give and take. When they went through Mt Hull, they looked at roads they could decommission. There are others that are going to be put in.

JD - But when you are decommissioning those roads, you are restricting how the logging is done. What Gary said is that they are making it completely unviable to log when they decommission the roads.

AH - They said that some were being decommissioned near the water and creating roads higher up where they do want to log. We should have a conversation with them, just to see what they are talking about in re decommissioning and creating roads.

CB- It's something I'd have to go look at There are a bunch of factors in there that should be considered.

JD - I think in Tripod, Ray Campbell took his horse and rode through areas where you could hardly see where they (*roads*) had been. Lots of reproduction. They tore up the road. Pulled up all the rocks and now the rocks are on top - you can't get through with anything, not even a horse.

CB - When you decommission roads, sometimes those roads also have the actual contour that makes it like a water bar. Im sure there is some kind of science they are using - that's why I want to go and look at it.

AH - I'd say we invite them into here under coordination. Number one, the USFS manages the property - they don't own it. They come in ,and they look at it.....we say here are some roads you might not want to decommission....

CB - But I want to look at it. I want to have a conversation. To come here and talk, this doesn't do me much good.

AH - Problem with me looking at it, I don't have a topographic app, etc. What I want to know is the general idea behind what they are doing. Are you putting in rippers. If there is reprod, are you going to tear it out? Are there any roads you want to gate that you could make viable in case of fire, other things? etc.

PH - Do you want the letter rewritten?

CB - Your letter was fine. It pointed out what we are talking about. #1 - when you see roads, and how you measure your successes, if you they are made aware of it and we use that as a metric - we don't always think this is positive.

There are a bunch of comment letters that went in. Have you seen them? We are not doing....there are actually comment letters right now that say that very thing. There are others that address the burning, the positives and negative of that. It is worth looking at all this stuff...although the letters you sent.....you are pointing out the issues that are not always the most positive thing. I think the letter is well-tempered. Not nasty. As long as you keep this dialogue with the agency, it is good.

AH - To Tanya Craig With the interlocal agreed with the RTPO...? A side conversation.

AH - We have an executive session now. We will pick up BLM next time around.

PH reviews what can be put off until later.....Fairgrounds, budget later.

Exec Session for 20 minutes - Tanya Craig

Note taker asks PH for clarification on Comp Plan process:

*New draft, 2014 version and current plan - to be looked at.

*PH is working on the SEPA Checklist for Comp Plan now.

*Scoping will be after new draft is out.

*People should be looking at all ordinances (*or versions of Comp Plan?*)

*Then DS (Determination of Significance) will be issued and Scoping will be done.

*Nothing has been proposed as to a More Completely Planned Area (MCPA) for lower Methow in Comp Plan.

Note taker leaves around 4:00 - 4:30 PM