

Okanogan Board of County Commissioners
3/12/18

Present:

Chris Branch, (CB) BOCC
Andy Hover - (AH) BOCC
Jim DeTro - (JD)
Angie Hubbard- (AHu)) Land use, Planner II
Lanie Johns - (LJ) County Clerk
Perry Huston - (PH) Director of Planning and Development & Administrative Officer
Dave Gechas - (DG) Chief Civil Deputy Attorney

Fairground Budget Group - Leah McCormack (County Treasurer) Carrie, unnamed gentleman, Tanya Craig (Risk Management), Debi Hilts (Human Resources), others

These notes have been taken by one of several volunteer citizen note takers and published on the website of Represent Okanogan County (ROC.) The notes have been taken as close to verbatim as possible, with any writer's comments or explanations in italics. For officially approved minutes of Board of Commissioner meetings, normally published at a later date, see www.okanogancounty.org.

Summaries:

1) Draft Comprehensive Plan: Total of about 1 hour.

Alternatives: The BOCC's review of a draft Comprehensive Plan is under a review continued from 3/6/18, centering this time around a discussion of **Alternatives for the Environmental Impact Statement**. Huston reviews a "non-traditional" approach to drafts, advisory groups, public review, and scoping. BOCC/Huston compare the relative values of using 3 previous Comp Plans as the basis for Alternatives vs. population growth-based Alternatives (he presents a model of 3 such Alternatives.) A discussion ensues (mostly between Commissioners Branch and Hover) regarding the relative value of using county-wide population growth vs addressing growth distribution in various areas of the county (including some consideration of growth in cities and city expansion areas.) The discussion includes whether to address impacts the expected (or preferred) types of economic growth (such as Ag, technology) might cause - and in what areas of the county. Huston will re-draft the suggested Alternatives that deal with population growth including language that could address growth distribution.

Chapter 12, Public Health and Safety: This brief discussion includes such items as wildlife and the tax effects of public land ownership. *(The title of Chapter 12 is designed to avoid unnecessary polarization centering around issues that are often included in an "environmental" section.)* **Further discussion of the Comprehensive Plan will continue on 3/13/18 at 3:00 PM.**

2) Shorelines Master Program: Brief. The county has received a response from the WDOE regarding the next tier of requested changes. In Huston's opinion, the major issue is with pub-

lic access to the river. **Deadline: County had 30 days to respond**, but by accident the letter was not distributed to BOCC, so time is of the essence. Exact deadline not clear.

3) **Fairground Budget:** Estimated total about 1 hour, although note taker left after 45 minutes. A lengthy and detailed work session on the fairgrounds budget for 2018 is led by Hover and Leah McCormack's financial team plays an active part.

Proceedings:

1:30 Executive Session. Attendees: DG, PH, AH, CB. Topic: Litigation

1:50 -Commissioners return. No decisions were made.

1:50 DRAFT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW

PH - Anything more to discuss on on resource lands?

AH - We looked it over. We will be moving on with Scoping. *(Note: I had mentioned to Andy on Friday that I was waiting for the invitation to submit scoping comments. At that point, he thought there had already been a legal notice to submit scoping comments.)*

PH - “Non-traditional” approach to order of draft, advisory groups, public review, scoping:

PH - Our timeline is first to create the document going out for public review. We are doing this differently from many counties, for good or bad. In many counties, first draft is with advisory groups, etc. Ok county - BOCC have been more active in creating the first draft that will create public review. *(Note: I believe this was said in order to avoid OCC*

AH - Points out we are working from a draft that already had a lot of public review.

PH - We have not started the adoption process yet. We will pick a draft that will go out for review.

First draft will include checklist. Not required if you go with a Determination of Significance (DS.) I will do a checklist anyway. With that, we will go out for scoping. 1st notice will go out for the draft and checklist. Then scoping - you go out for specific issues and write the EIS. Already anticipating addressing wildfire, water, and so forth as issues - based upon litigation of existing Comp Plan. Draft will be released, then comments taken.

PH - What we did was issue a notice that we were going to revise comp plan. We asked people to identify issues. Sort of a “pre—scoping, pre-draft.” This was at the suggestion of legal folks. Took public comments, and they have informed the creation of a new draft. *(Note-taker: This “pre-scoping” comment period was in the fall of 2017, with a due date of comments being October 13, 2017 - but it did not solicit scoping comments at that time.)*

Picking up alternatives at this point, the legal advice was to take the 1964 Comp Plan, 2014 Comp Plan, and revise...also, as selected, parts of 2012 draft. That is not the traditional approach to alternatives. It works, but not traditional.

Alternatives - We are talking about a manner of getting to where you want to go. Identify the differences. Alternatives....all paths will lead to density. Water, wildfire, density. What does Comp Plan and subsequently zoning code say regarding density?

Alternatives:

Alternative 1: You always have a No Action Alternative. That would be benign regarding wildfire, critical areas, etc.

Alternative 2: Maintain Existing Density but to decrease lot size (clusters, density near services, etc.) Decreasing actual footprint of human interaction. Some would argue that this improves protection in re wildfire, by concentrating in areas to protect, more green space, etc.

Alternative 3: Reduce Density - increase lot size, adjust current settlement pattern where services are best available, wildfire interfere - this can improve i. Fewer houses to protect. Concentrate houses where least danger and better protected. Water - decreasing demand on services and water. Settlement pattern. Footprint is decreased.

Alternative 4: Blank at this time.

AH - Where do population estimates fit in?

PH - Will be consistent with PEA (Planning Enabling Act) - supposed to consider population as you propose land use regs. If it projects a moderate growth pattern, there is no reason to increase density, even under No action Alternative. Same with Alt 2 - still have enough opportunity on paper to deal with any population projection.

Alternative - If trying to tie growth pattern to land use regulation, reducing density would be consistent.

AH - Isn't no action and maintaining density the same?

PH - You can maintain density but still decrease lot size. For example, you wouldn't have a cluster way back at the edge of a remote area. While maintaining density, adjusting settlement pattern and lot size to decrease footprint.

CH - If density is a number, you are re-distributing it.

AH - Where would increasing the density fit?

PH - It depends upon how many Alternatives we want to have. If this is an alternative, it could decrease lot size. Would want to have a reason to do it. If it is going to reduce density, it does not mean in all areas. Some areas already lend themselves to an increase - some parts of county could actually increase, others decrease.

Could take this approach to create all alternatives...to give people the opportunity during the draft EIS to comment on which would be most appropriate,

AH - You will get better info from public in commenting on these Alternatives than to comment on the previous Comp Plans.

PH - I would agree myself, but it is not my decision

CB - One way or the other, it has to do with density. There are so many areas where you can re-allocate densities to a more appropriate place.

PH - We are beginning to see, as Gene goes through buildable lands analysis we are not doing by sub basin - you can see that for the most part - you are seeing density directed toward the transportation grid. Some were done along known water supply. But most was going along transportation areas. Disproportionate areas of 1 acre zoning. For example, Tunk. Not that many lots up there now, but there is potential for many lots because there is a road going through it.

AH - Buildable lands map - should be sent to PC along with this, right?

PH - but their primary role will be to inform EIS. Now they will follow the (?) for water supply, more appropriate because we are now looking mostly at the water supply. We are looking at the reaches....

CB - When they followed transportation corridors, was capacity of transportation corridors looked at?

PH - Some of it. Public works looked at this, but not exhaustive analysis.

CB - Relates to how much it costs to service the area that you are providing densities for.

PH - Some of PC identified areas in San Oil as not appropriate for dense development. Some of this in the Chiliwist too.

CB - (hard to hear.) When you are looking at re-distributing densities...you will not know if you have raised density or not. Begins to become irrelevant when you look at the whole county. Must consider Urban growth areas and cities.

PH - We have not been completely successful in tying capital facilities to roads.

CB - Then you get into emergency services, including EMS.... Increased density - I look at what I am looking at and I have trouble looking at overall density as an alternative. When I see alternatives, I can't readily identify them as a good or a bad thing if I am going to choose among these. There are sections of the county that have had comments made... you identify these sub areas. One of them may result in an increased density due to clustering. Same density or not. Looking at Alternatives, I would comment as a citizen saying I like this alternative, but I want to maintain a rural area, etc. but to reduce density might not treat the area in which I live in the way I would like.

PH - of course we would need to explain each of the alternatives. This is just some of my "doodlings."

CB - I am thinking of the neighborhoods. Why does this result in? Are we trying to satisfy those concerns? Does that reduce to these alternatives?

AH - Do these alternatives...we could make alternatives based upon the reduction in population, maintenance or the low, medium, and high projections of population density. Where are you trying to go with the alternatives?

CB - I am trying to get you to come up with a solution. Laughter.

AH - I look at all of them. When talking about Comp Plan which deals with how county will look in the future. you are planning on density of people.

CB - Distribution of density.

AH - That is though Zoning, etc. What are you looking at? Ag county, technological county? Where are the guiding principles? That is based upon population, in my opinion. Say Seattle is going to grow and people can live here but work out of China? Then we have to account for that. Or if we look at trends and we are on a medium path, can look at OFM (Office of Financial Management) data - plan for medium growth. Or looking at current graph of population growth, with the fact that we are below medium and at low point of OFM, we could plan for lower growth. I think that ...I understand what you are saying....if you don't hear this conversation and I say I want to reduce density in our area..or I want o maintain density....I want to increase density here because this is a good place to put people You may comment in a different way. I think our Alternatives should deal with population growth. We can actually use historical data.

CB we can drive population growth -...what we do has to do with population growth too. When we talk about GMA, when it comes to rural places, the

AH I am still.....

CB - Still getting at this. when we talk about what we are looking at, if we get into technology, farming /forestry, etc. so we have a lot of people move here. My question is where are we going to put all those people?

AH - But we have to examine alternatives.

CB -In looking at this, I am going to maintain the density in order towhere am I going to put those folks? So when I do this exercise, WITH the cities...that total population includes cities.

PH - Does the overall county population projections project (?) between incorporated and unincorporated populations?

CB - When we look at the economy of the county, that..it should include the cities' population. So until we are done doing this, the alternative isn't apparent.

PH These lend themselves to being intertwined as to population. Low, medium, high - we could use those, Alt 1 - low population increase, and then say how you would deal with projected populations. In Ellensburg, it was appealed....the urban growth area - couldn't justify it even with high population increase. County had no argument. It was another organization that brought the appeal. The populations also serve as a sort of a limit. As you point out, those population projections depend upon all kinds of things.

CB -- yes, in terms of Kittitas county....

PH Almost compromised between cities and counties almost feeding future expansion, they wanted this tied to population project. Could use this info in different ways.

CB - when it comes to the alternatives, and you want to go to a scoping process, that scoping process could produce info....the alternatives I look at right now, and we only have the 3, I couldn't tell you that I wanted to reduce that - because I would want to know where the density was being reduced? Overall in the county, or placed in certain areas?

PH - Are the BOCC more comfortable in using the 3 comp plans as alternatives, or with something more focused?

CB - thinking!

AH - I am curious as to what you have to say.

CB - I would say this Alternatives aren't definite enough to be good Alternatives.

AH - And I think the Comp Plans are not defined enough.

PH - Then let me look at sub-interactions of all this.

CB - Of all the work that has been done, what is the message as to what is wrong with our Comprehensive Planning effort?

PH - In many respects, we probably could have taken the 2014 plan, put in a good water section, revised the Resource lands, and called it a day.

CB - If you did that, and the only things we really did was add a water section, which speaks to water and growth.then we looked at resource lands designations....the problem is that they do not meet the requirements of the Act in my opinion. And there have been comments (*to that effect?*)

So the distribution of density seems to be one of the outstanding issues.

AH - I still think it's driven by populations. You are going to go into transportation, etc. in relation to population.

CB - In re cities and urban growth areas, do we have any info as to where we are aiming in regards to OFM? Do we have a plan that better serves the population objectives that have been chose?

pH - Way back, when we were draft things on the higher projection - ie "worst case scenario." A fair amount of citizen comment came in that those growth rates are grossly over projected. At the first iteration of Comp Plan, the intention of BOCC was to emulate the language of the GMA. We wrote the plan around GMA terms. The idea behind that was that soon we would need to go over to GMA pretty soon, and best to look at it now. So the analysis regarding population and the finding that it was going to be very low, even lower than the lowest, we didn't need to ever worry about being in the GMA, so let's get rid of all the GMA terminology. All of the GMA language came out.

What is our true population projection? I am eagerly awaiting the 2020 census. If you took a clip board for every given day, hard numbers are appreciatively greater than we think they are.

AH - So you type in Okanogan County population - 40,000 some. If you look between 1970 to 2015, it is a pretty linear growth rate. 64 people per year. Would take us 25 years from now, based on this, to get to 50,000 people. You can look at the projections in 2010 and see that we are not meeting their population projections. We are doing exactly what the graph said we'd do. The alternatives can't just be ...I don't think they can be like that. They need to be based upon some sort of actual...if we don't do anything, we don't need another plan over 1964. But if we do, we need to XYZ.

CB - No matter what we do, we need to decide the distribution of growth. It describes where the growth should happen. Does not say we need to move people into cities or that we need to make clustering ordinances. It says that based upon population growth, we need to plan for a certain model. When the plan is formed, you get down to zonings tc. Look t the transportation section of this.(goes on screen to *Rural lands. History, line 935.*) Diversity, wide range of compatible uses.... proposed actives....this tells me that basically we should make sure our real lands have good flexibility, but that we still need to have rural areas. Not saying if we should move people into or out of rural areas. Just saying that based on he way this county is growing, we need to have this rural area.

So if I have a land use map of OK County, land use ...then a land use map, then we say that, generally speaking, we say this is where the growth will occur. If I take overalls and critical areas and then road systems, look at services and infrastructure. Does it make sense to have more growth in this particular area or that area? A land use map will usually say that. Within those areas, zoning takes place.

AH - if you were looking at the highest density you could look at, the map would look a lot different. But that's where you get to the expected growth rate. Do not have city expansion areas that are 20 miles long, where we have to put in infrastructure on a weekly basis. Trying to get to a point where we say our alternatives are based on population projections. This will show external forces that help structure the zoning

CB - I agree. That's how we get there. It's all relative.

AH - Hard as an Alternative..... it's hard for some people to see these as Alternatives.

CB - Do you want more growth, or stay the same?

HA - I want it to grow in a manner in which Ag is an extensive part of the community.

CB - My perspective to do that, is that you have areas that are zoned appropriately, you have areas that lend themselves like this.

AH - So Alts might say are we looking at technology? or ???

CB - If I am looking at economics, not just the economics of what we pay for, but what kind of work we provide in this county, when we talk about ecology aside from your ability to communicate from ? (telecommunication) ...must have centers for those industries....this is where we go.

AH - We can say regarding economy...do we want to encourage technological growth, alternative transportation...still comes back to alternatives as to why you created....

CB - I see density on this in relation to place.

AH - That is why I think we should choose slow growth, medium growth, fast growth..... in knowing we are growing slowly, we still need an economic section. Do we aim to grow faster..or can the economy increase without growing faster?

CB - Would Alternatives include things like maintaining urban growth density, increase urban density together? The opposite? If I am talking about distribution of density, I can carve it out.

AH - No Action...?

CB - Is it actually maintaining? In a general way, I'm looking at population growth but in a general way.....where does it make sense to allocate the growth? If afar, what are our standards for development? Because these areas today do not have what is required for that level of development? Today we heard about (?) sounds for fire trucks. Is that possible or not? Access for law enforcement? Do we have low standards in some of these areas.... what will it cost us? In lawsuits, etc. So I'd like to include economics in terms of how we flourish, etc.

PH - If we set off for a high population increase, it always increases stress on affordable, housing, water supply, transportation, public safety. If you are planning for robust growth rate, trying to locate city centers, and so forth becomes more important. Conversely, low population growth - not much impact. You can deal with water supply issues and so forth almost as status quo.

Why I am trying to consolidate so you do not have 3 comp plans. A smorgasbord of inputted issues all in once place. Going to address water and all those things, but will do it differently if you are planning for high population growth or low growth and do it differently.

AH - You choose raw preferred Alternative. But where are those alternatives where people can look at? Do they actually do an EIS on every alternative?

PH - No

AH - We say we choose an alternative because, or ????

CB - Best approach of economics, etc?

PH - Say city expansion areas. I would imbed in that the 3 alternatives and how it affects how you would eventually approve a city expansion area. with low population growth, wouldn't have that much. Medium, you'd need to pay more attention, because if you are going to provide affordable housing for growing population, you don't want to do that in very rural area. High growth - even more attention.

CB - Control of an urban expansion area in size...based on plans for future....where are the plans for developing infrastructure? Do our transportation plans have the plans? Plans for infrastructure for technology? These are the places you will have to go.....

PH - Which is the analysis you would do in EIS.

CB - The vision statement should state that. Our object is to grow in these ways. Ag. Technology. If Ag, we don't want technology projects in Ag lands unless they are Ag - related.

PH - We are discussing all this now because last time we thought we would write the EIS around the zone code. That is not traditional - we would issue.... do EIS on zoning or Comp plan. Last time we did it on zoning.

CB - We want growth, but we want it in the right place. When it boils down to density, you are right. But where it occurs matters.

PH - You are right. I will write different language and see if we can tie it to population projections.

PH - Go now to public safety in Comp Plan. Public Works is looking at circulation element.

CB - How has public safety weighed in?

PH - They created the circulation element, but everyone thought it was too long and complicated. This one is not that different from 2014. Have asked Josh and Ben to look at it.

CHAPTER 12 - Public Health and Safety. PH: I did this rather than 'environmental protection,' which could raise red flags.

Line 1422 - PH

Wildlife

CB. - Asks how wildlife relates to public health and safety.

AH & PH - knowing that wildlife is protected relates to public health and safety. As you project the critical areas, it helps public health - water quality, etc.

Tax burden - public land ownership

AH - Line 1446 - "tax burden on public lands public ownership should be discouraged...." should be changed. I don't want to discourage people from selling to WDFW but I want everyone to understand the consequences.

PH - I almost pulled that. Cup half full, cup half empty. This discussion has gone on for years and this has persisted.

AH - Need to change verbiage so that people know that we are not getting funded for public lands.....

PH - Suggests this be removed and put under "Coordination.

CB - Also it is not always the case that it increases the tax burden.

AH - When isn't it?

CB - If you are not paying a lot of taxes on your property in the first place, ...

AH - I would actually say that.. this will sound strange I think it increases the tax burden all the way around, because

JD - BPA acquisition - they....(people came in?_

CB - that is not every case...

AH - There may be some cases where you do not lose any money, where an individual is paying taxes on the residential lots...you pay more taxes.

CB - True. Not in every place.

PH - We will move it to "Coordination."

CB - But it needs to mention politics around maintaining public lands. If not, legislature can cut funding to those lands in order to make your case.

On one hand, I approve having public lands but I do not supply \$\$ to maintain them. There are variations that we could be in charge of and make work for us; but if it is not in the Comp Plan, we may not be able to do this.....

PH - 3:00 is here. Do we want to address later this week?

LJ - We do not have time tomorrow. Depends upon auditor.

CB - If we could squeeze in tomorrow, it would be best.

AH -If we can get staff in here at 9 PM.

DT - At 4:00 if we have no citizen comment, we'd have time.

PH, all - 3:00 tomorrow to continue with Comp Plan.

Shorelines Master Program Update

SMP - We got a letter from Ecology with next tier of requested SMP changes. We have 30 days.

AH - did you send it?'

PH - Melissa distributed it. You have to scroll past Melissa's letter.

LJ - It came through last week, late last Friday.

PH - Attention : biggest change - public access. In our estimation, it's the biggest change. - We said "We don't have to, unless"... Ecy said, "You have to unless." Please look at this. Should be picked up no later than study session next week. The clock is officially tickling. I can send it back out (No BOCC can find anything from Melissa in their e-mail.)

AH - It was not sent around.

PH - I will send around so it is at the top of your list.

3:00 - Fairgrounds. Recess until 3:05.

3:05: Fairgrounds budget work season.

Summary

The financial team is working with BOCC on the 2018 budget for the fairgrounds using historic information over past years: receipts, expenditures, income. Detailed discussion of facilities expenses, insurance, propane, phones, utilities, dumpsters, trucks; discussion of income from facilities rental fees, Agriplex fees, use of annex, RV storage fees. Some items are considered "bare bones." at this time. Discrepancies are explained.

Note taker left at 3:45, committee is still going strong.