

Okanogan Board of County Commissioners

5.9.2016

JD - Jim DeTro (BOCC)
RC - Ray Campbell (BOCC)
SK - Sheilah Kennedy (BOCC)
LJ - Lalena Johns, Clerk of the Commissioners
PH - Perry Huston, Director of Planning
BR - Ben Rough, Public Works Administrator
AL - Albert Lin, Okanogan County attorney
JB - Jim Brown, WDFW
DM - Donny Marterello, WDFW
LD - Lael Duncan, Community Action
SR - Skip Rosenthal, Okanogan Behavioral Health Care
UP1 - Unidentified person #1, Housing Coalition
UP2 - Unidentified person #2, Housing Coalition

Contents: Unemployment, disability, homelessness, housing coalition; WAG - lethal removal of wolves; Budget; VSP; Chewuch Travel Plan (possible lawsuit); EPA/ECY Public Disclosure request.

(Notetakers' comments and clarifications in italics. Notes are either summary or verbatim, whichever is possible in the course of the discussion.)

9:00 Governor's Committee on unemployment and disability.

Content: Sheilah Kennedy works on these issues and is reporting back on progress, possibilities for developing Leadership for all groups working on these issues so they can pull together, issues regarding education and training,

Sheilah - Mayor of Okanogan, Omak - public members told what they were facing, what the need was. A veteran showed up. I was able to talk about Eric's program, once people sign up, community action program. His biggest issue was not the benefits, but no education training. He wants to get into cyber security field but will have to move out of town to get that education. His was more on the education component More than enough services here. Obviously the governor's committee was writing things down.

RC - Are there classes available on line?

SK - Friday in office, I explained those issues. Eric and I will meet to see if we can work with someone to provide. Nothing at Wen Valley College North - I said even if we could use their conference room to provide internet to provide classes here....

RC - We can't give service here unless - ...(couldn't hear.) SK - At WSU, the courthousethey can tie in to Pullman. Eric has some ideas. Is that something we could provide through Shane and Eric? Vets are coming back and wanting to work.

SK - Legis passed in 2010. Still waiting for the actual number. It allows the county and BOCC authority to develop a committee established of people w disabilities that meet and figure out what the needs are and bring people together. DSHtribe, college ...etc all doing their own stuff, not pulling together. This committee is supposed to take it to the level of those with disabilities. I want to suggest to BOCC that we establish some kind of local leadership team, composed of the same individuals that were there (hospitals, clinics, cities, DSHS, etc - anyone who already has their own program. The people with disabilities can figure out who should be on committee, and everyone is working on it, can make a difference. Mayor Culp of Okanogan was going to come up for a discussion to see what your thoughts are.

RC - Are there some locals who would be willing? (Can't hear ...he is back far from mic.)

SK - This is more focused on people supplying services. State agencies and programs providing , Tribe....to connect the dots. I think if we try and put it out there and see what the interest is, we have folks who could lead that. Told them we don't have problem making decision to get people with disabilities together, but to take to next level...if everyone at table can hear, we can organize but the agencies would need to take the lead.

RC - very interested.

Parent to Parent

Summary - Transportation, respite care, space for meetings

SK - Brought parents of people with disabilities together. Funding went away, not sure how it came back to our levelstill need to work on that, but it is coming back. Brings parents together.

RC - so more on adolescents? SK- NO, birth to whatever. Huge things - transportation system. They will be starting new transport routes through Methow, Tonasket, etc. 7AM to 7PM so they can get to appointments. Respite services - now they have to drop off kids in Spokane. Need to work on that. In big dream, nice to have a building in Okanogan so someone can come in where parent can drop off individual, fully staff.

RC - Something like that should be distributed to local areas. These are all concerns and local issues not being addressed locally.

SK - State is asking what the commissioners could do....we could approve the committees... maybe come up with a vacant building we could surplus. Is it better to have one in Okanogan, or to have several?

RC - If we are going to have a place people can drop off kids,fades out...I think he said there would need to be several centrally located places.

SK - earlier I was at aging adults/kids - so many kids now taking care of parents, there may be a similar need for people who need to work, etc. So it kind of goes through a different perspective than just disabilities. Some of this is getting out of our scope as commissioners.

RC - Legislations that passed?

SK - Would be up to leadership team to figure out the grants, etc. RC - Some level of care day care etc. ..would have to have a secure dollar amount...

RC - Is there more?

SK - I have pages and pages of notes. If there is something we can work out in hospitals, etc.

RC - There is all kinds of room, but scattered about (in Brewster...) Adult care...couldn't hear...RC fades out.

9:30 JD - we have a conference call.

Interagency Wolf Committee Conference Call on Lethal Removal/WAG

Summary: Jim Brown and Donny Marterello (WDFW) describe the recent work of the Wolf Advisory Group (WAG) in developing multiple protocols for lethal control. They are collecting thoughts of BOCC for upcoming WAG meeting on Wednesday on revised protocol for lethal removal, including different scenarios for determining when to implement lethal control (e.g., 4 point system, with points assigned for single event, repeat, multiple animals, whether the livestock owner has been using non-lethal control methods). Public notification involving weekly updates with annual reports. Transparency, staff safety. Additional notification to Sheriff.

Commissioners express concerns about: public safety during lethal control operations; slow response by WDFW in implementing lethal control; danger to public posed by wolves. JD asserts multiple cases where information on wolf attacks on humans has been suppressed. Commissioners repeatedly urge WDFW to relocate wolves to western Washington to help achieve full recovery and removal from state endangered list.

DISCUSSION:

DM: Thanks for being available on such short notice. Last WAG meeting - We were revising protocol for lethal removal. On Wed, WAG members want to see that product so that revised protocol is in place. One step is to check in with you folks. Want to collect your thoughts / . Will send your ideas to WAG in an e-mail, same with other BOCC in Eastern WA.

JB - Ok County is in 2 management zones, east and west of 97, etc. Need to be sure we are talking about where state has authority as currently exists in OK County. Talking about where the state can exercise authority east of 97. DM - add that any time we are talking about state threshold for lethal removal, US Fish & Wildlife would use same standard of threshold for management action, so that it would be same protocol in both sections (including Western portion of state.)

JD - Also on north boundary of county, Canadian border. If you come south on east half of 97, hallway down is the reservation.

RC - Is that Hwy 97 north/south or Hwy 17?

JB - One comes down 97, hits 17, and is at 17 if you head south. JB - to Detrol, I have your slide here. I have it sitting in front of you. We can call this to attention of WAG.

JD - Shows multiple jurisdictions in Ok County.

JB- Good point, shows that part of Washington - if you go 10 miles this way it's Canada, 10 miles another way, delisted but state listed, *on Reservation, different jurisdiction. Calls out complexity of landscape. In (?) area, many different jurisdictions.*

RC - Wolves are pretty darn smart, maybe they can figure it out.

WAG DISCUSSION:

(Notetakers did not have access to the powerpoint with figures referred to on Slide 9.)

DM - What I sent to you. Pulled up powerpoint presentation of internal department meetings. About 15 pages long. Conversation evolving, will hit highlights of discussion:

Slide 9: On top, option 1A, was option 4. At last WAG, talked about principles we want to be part of lethal removal. Broke into 3 groups....grabbed various ideas. developed conversation. Deferred to Dept, went back, said bring back to us the options. More brainstorming. We did that and shared with WAG. Will focus on elements rising to top. Slide 9 Option 1A - Talking about threshold of lethal removal. What would it be? Creative idea: Depredation counts unit of 1, threshold of 4. If producer being non-lethal, the count would be 1.5 toward count of 4. For producer, if sequence of depredations of 1.5 to count of 4, introduce lethal at point of 3. If producer not being proactive, count as 1 and initiated non-lethal, later depredations count as 1.5

Idea presented: - being able to deal with variabilities as to how the ranchers (producers) are using non-lethal. The "Big Kicker" - update to do non lethals proactively producers (ranchers, etc.) would get lethal removal sooner if doing proactive stuff.

Other thoughts - if pack that was resource concern, for example, if no federal listing status, the example - If it were first pack south of I90, want to recover them. If they started depredations, might wait until higher count because they are of more concern and we really want them there.

Other idea - Recognizing past history. If pack had couple of depredations in past, maybe year before, kind of meets definition of chronic, if 2 more depredations later, would initiate removal. See if there is broader history that needs to be considered. Period of time for depredations counting toward threshold? Between 4-6 months brought up. We said no,,, maybe calendar year, which captures grazing season... if there is sort of a "reset" tied to the cycle of pups to adults, April to April, it would be good, We threw out calendar year as to counting toward threshold.

Depredation event - Recall some situations w single livestock carcass, equivalent to larger size livestock, more typical situation is several livestock such as 5-10 sheep dead.

(RC - Interrupts: "such as Dave Dashiell had to go through," referring to the 250 sheep Dashiell is said to have lost.)

WDFW - Difficulty on a calf carcass - is it a single event or not? Example of one pack - yes, one is a wolf 2 days later, another carcass....is that part of a kill that happened at same pack, or different days? Looks like same incident but more decomposed. Difficult for staff to tell. Rule of thumb - carcass equals depredation for larger livestock, but with smaller livestock may be different events.

Be want to be sure public always notified if depredation in removal. Also if lethal removal. Be totally open and transparent. Once the decision is made, weekly updates to public. Exception - we work with Sheriff, so county a bit different. Provide public with brief updates - and then a completed report in confidence at end of year. Rationale - to be able to carry out removal without interruption by public, staff safety issue. Exception would be with county authority because we often use sheriff for investigations or helicopter work.

9:40: 2nd notetaker arrives.

SK - Will location be publicized?

JB - Prefer not to: staff safety, interference; general area only.

SK - not transparent then. Concerned about public safety (tourists & residents, horseback riders)

JB - Work with local sheriff's office to secure area (traps, helicopter use)

SK - How do recreationists get updates? Option 1A looks like it will penalize people that don't want to participate in state programs. Could pit the people against each other. There are reasons people don't want to participate. Concerned about penalizing them. Will the agency be relocating animals? Report says you can.

RC - that is important. Move line from Cascade range. Not enough animals on west side of Cascades. Why can't we relocate them to the west side?

WDFW - Can't speak for other folks. Has been some cohesion on Option 1. Concerned about pitting people against each other. There have been unintended consequences with people not being treated equally. Option 1A got support from some of the livestock owners on WAG. Another option with some cohesion is the idea that the lethal removal threshold is a straight-forward 4. Basic level of nonlethal deterrence would be required (e.g., sanitation and one other deterrent; BMP's). Pro-active producers could have lethal removal at 3. Another question is length of time for accruing points toward lethal removal. Is there a way to set to clock on points, based on wolf life cycle.

RC - do you have example where there was predation and then it stops?

WDFW - do have some examples - hazing, single removal, pack break-up.

RC - is that being monitored? Is there information available that connects the dots for us? Are we talking reality or wishful thinking?

SK - so much pressure on producers (*ranchers, etc*) - fencing, picking up dead cows. Extreme pressure on producers - they are struggling. Are we learning from other states where there are too many wolves and they are shooting them all. Seems like it is all on the producers.

Martello - where recovery targets have been met there is more flexibility for lethal removal.

SK - Or where there are too many, relocate them. Without that we won't get to statewide recovery and the burden will be on the eastern counties.

RC - need more concern for people who have skin in the game.

Martello - more discussion tomorrow and next day. What animals are considered livestock? Current protocols include herding dogs while herding & guarding dogs while guarding. Pets at home don't count toward threshold.

SK - our working dogs are 24 hours working animals whether at home or not.

RC - (*concur with Sheila's comment*). Pet depredation is still depredation; still poses as threat; all should be counted.

SK - has the group addressed the scenario when the first person is killed?

Martello - No.

JD - research shows that wolves will eat people when they don't have enough prey. Two women & their dogs in Craters of the Moon. Suppressed the investigation. Miley Cyrus has the money to suppress Prince of Wales Island wolves killing people. What is going to happen when snowpack is so heavy that everything is driven to the valley floor? Disaster when that happens.

Martello - addressing SK's question. We agree that if there is an injury or mortality to human, that animal will be removed. Human life is the most important thing.

SK - if that happens you will have a full-blown war. When that does happen we have a disaster on our hands. Don't understand why it is not being discussed. Get on with relocation so we can begin managing.

RC - When, not if. I heard at WAG that it never happens.

Martello - Micro-management by stakeholders. WAG is advising department on policy, not micro-managing actions. Evaluating at the end of the year. Our conflict management staff makes recommendations. Different situations around state. NE Washington - deterrence became too burdensome to continue. Assessment made by local boots on ground staff. Hearing the idea of cumulative assessment over years, where low level predation is occurring over multiple years.

RC - in the end run, what takes place between wolves, livestock and people falls back on WDFW. Have faith and trust in some staff (JB & Martello). Others have whole lot of idealism, they will hide facts. Need a housecleaning within the department.

JD - expressed all the way to the Director - as a result of what happened in the other northern tier counties, Okanogan County has gone silent. Seen what happened in Stevens county. Lives threatened. People have gone underground. Don't know how you are going to deal with that. WAG has doubled in size, turning into a bureaucracy. Get to the point where they are an advisory group. You are the ultimate control and you don't have to take that advice. People with skin in the game.

RC - Dave Dashiell (*Brother of County Commissioner*) in Stevens County was driven out of business (threats, depredation). WDFW should have done a better job.

Martello - current policy is not working well. Moving forward with WAG process to identify alternatives. They are advisory, not regulatory. We hope that they will coalesce around recommendations for the director. Have heard discussion about protocol establishing the WDFW discretion to deal with unusual situation that isn't covered well by policy. For instance, high, sudden predation.

SK - doesn't the agency have that discretion now?

Martello - we like to operate within the scope of plan and protocol (transparency), but they are not regulatory. We have to operate within WAC.

SK - sounds like you want public approval before you step outside of plan. So you were slow in helping that producer (*who lost so many animals*)

Martello - we are trying to modify protocol to allow us to move quickly. The more we operate within the protocol the safer we are from litigation.

SK - fine line. You will eventually be in litigation. Agency needs to maintain authority & responsibility.

JD (*thanks Donny & Jim for keeping in contact on the subject; thanks in both direction*)

Martello - are you comfortable with sending notes to WAG? (YES)

10:34 Homelessness Plan (not on published agenda)

Discussion summary: Discussion revolved around the development of a plan for reducing homelessness - who will do what. Cost of construction identified as a major problem in replacing low income housing that burned- now some low income families cannot afford replacement housing and are homeless. Highest priority is to stabilize low income families who are at risk of becoming homeless - general agreement on committee. SK/RC push for explanations on lack of progress for existing homeless. Loss of housing during the fires cited as one cause, but committee pointed out it is an issue state-wide and high population areas get the priority. The need for affordable, clean, secure housing emphasized. County Emergency Reserve fund help was expected but didn't get to programs needing it.

LD, SR, UP1 and UP2 take places at table

SK - Need plan identifying specifics of who does (has done) what and how they will do it. Looking forward to more specifics.

LD - have met; voted to bring Room 1 into coalition. They have not yet agreed. Expecting to hear back in the next couple of days. Have reviewed what we have been doing in the last 10 years. Agree we need update. Homeless housing is the bulk of funding. Are updating and revising documents. Are meeting monthly. Identifying information gaps, who will gather. A lot of work to be done. Discussing what that will look like, who will take from the recording fees to accomplish the work, where will that take us? This is a good process. Executive director had broad knowledge, but now we are trying to spread knowledge base. (*Describes confusion over funding request*).

SK - Biggest reason for meeting was to pull committee back together. Does Nancy think this is tomorrow? (*Nancy Nash Mendez, HUD? Apparently there was confusion with published agenda.*) Someone else: Alana not coming.

LD - It is up to you. Just want to make sure the process is clear.

SK - process is, committee makes recommendation to commission.

Lael (LD) - who wants to go first? WE have met since we met with you. We did vote to bring Room Now into the coalition, but they have not formally accepted. They are interested in continuing involvement. Hope to hear back from Alana. We looked at our processes that we have operated under for 10 years and acknowledge we need to revise our MOU. Some things were under affordable housing, some under homeless.. affordable housing is the basis..meeting on monthly basis to touch in with everyone. Depending upon what board decides a lot of work to be done in the way of collating and assigning info gathering, etc. A lot of work, projected work that needs to be done. We are all discussing what is reasonable to take from recording fees to get it done. what can we expect to achieve and evaluate? Where does it take us? What are we accomplishing? Really good process that has begun. For a lot time, existing director operated with understanding.....has made us look back and realize what the 3 of us knew, others did not know.

In terms of misunderstanding of funding for Caribou, I definitely support. We never did actually approve. Situation is that the housing coalition needed more info because of questions about reserve account being available to fund that chunk of project. Was going to come back to us, but never did. (Appears to be reference to the county emergency reserve fund? By county policy, it is supposed to be \$2 million at this point but has been depleted to a little over 1/4 of that amount, addressed around the same time that the state auditor's report came through.)

Sk - That's where it is confusing to me. I remember previous director coming in and looking for that funding.

LD - She was asking for support, but not because coalition had (asked?) We were waiting for more info. Ultimately your decision. No one here has an issue with use of funds. Keeping process alive...if you go out of process, a lot of questions. What is process?

SK - The committee does make a recommendation to BOCC. Right? Yes.

SR - It was a good wake up call, We looked at docs to see how it could be revised. Dealing with homeless stuff, we need to be a good resource as to what's going on. Need to develop a plan that's more locally relevant. We will do our own process on firing together numbers and share... there is only so much money. Homelessness in this county is a huge issue. It's a huge issue everywhere.

SK - Sometimes it's whole families.

SR - We renewed commitment to meet on a regular basis. Can't take on the whole thing - need to go step by step . Will meet, come up with our own inventory and priorities. This committee....we talk, etc. We need a backbone agency that coordinates. Community action does a good job, would be good coordinator.

RC - I'm a person who likes to see dollars with an objective, some kind of a trace of how that is taking place, and if not why . That's important. The end of this cycle...there wasn't much accountability.

SR- We can develop priorities and how we can measure.

SK - the day that you are not here and someone else is, we need....

Lael...We all need that, so we can move forward...Community action is in the process of bringing service providers together to provide a listing of all social service resources...put it on our website ..so people can do searches. Since I have been a gate keeper - going back to beginning, where we started, where we have come, where the county was and has changed.... and compare with what has happened state-wide. This is not unique to OK county...we were impacted by fires, but it is state-wide and we need to bring in legislators...I will be coming next week with a request for (? a kind of rehab funding.) We have people that are right on the edge. We are trying to work collaboratively, and you need a historical document that can be added to year by year.

RC - Affordable housing is probably the main problem. Depends upon construction regulations. Came up in a WSAC meeting. Increase in homeless and affordable housing - put cost of construction way out of reach.

Skip (SR) That is how discussions are going state wide. Talk of how investments can - Nancy - how many vouchers does she have? Something like 200, 400 on waiting list for vouchers. takes an act of congress to get the vouchers.

RC - down in Paterosaffordable rentals cannot be replaced because of cost of construction. Now the low income people are homeless.....

(LD) Real issue is affordable housing. Yes, some folks are chronically homeless....I think the better route is to get people stabilized before they get into a chronic situation. We can't afford to develop infrastructure for.....we are looking for 40, 60 ...not enough for the legislature to take notice. They will pile the \$\$ to hit more people in Seattle, because they are helping a larger number than we are.

I am serving on State Rural Development Council....access to people at the head of various agencies ...Last time, they were telling us various things to do..networking opportunity....gave some examples of what used to happen...used to find the land and put something together Need plan B's....it will take a long time, but we could move forward.

SR - Successes at our agencies...people get a job and get a little more stable. Then they get a place. We have people moving into apartments and taking jobs...rehab, expanding services for workshops and people with disabilities. Medicaid .. if you get 20 units, they would be filled tomorrow. etc. But other efforts that help people to become self sufficient are important...college, workforce,...get them a job in a packing plant, etc. Washing windows - this is the success we are getting. People getting jobs, securing an apt. Not just a matter of building...but also to work with employers.

(SR) We are continuing to meet and develop priorities. Huge issues in this county; only so much money. Assess who we are working with, who we should be working with, what we can tackle. Need a backbone agency who will coordinate us all.

RC - Concern about objective to reduce homelessness. Want to see how that will take place, if it doesn't, why?

SR - Want to provide you with accurate picture of what is going on.

SK - And to put it into a plan.

LD - We all need that. Community Action is putting together a resource guide, put it on our website. Have been gate keeper, am getting old. Go back to beginning, track what has been accomplished. Homeless went down and is now creeping back up. Statewide issue, not just fires. Coming with request for preserving existing housing for low income families. You need a historical document that can be added to every year.

LD - hard to get access to head of housing programs & network of decision-makers. Takes years to

SR - housing tied to the economy. Stabilizing homeless people (rehab, training, healthcare, employment). Medicaid is talking about providing funds for housing. Get them independent, self-sufficient. Success we are having is when they get jobs & leave our program.

JD - conversation the other day with a person concerned with seasonal influx. Mushroom pickers. Scrounging around, getting paid cash under the table. Have driven by marijuana grows - licenses from Oregon, California, Idaho - how do you differentiate them?

CC - they have to be income-qualified. HUD only recognizes legitimate income sources when providing help with housing.

SR - marijuana processing income is not recognized as agricultural.

LD - percentage of transitory occupations - they don't come in and go through whole process. It is arduous. They have to provide a lot of documentation.

SR - a lot of our programs require year lease.

SK - looking for group to provide recommendations as to whether they want Community Action to take the lead; whether the groups will provide financial support for coordination; how much.

SR - right now it is a word of mouth system. Need written compilation of resources for handing out.

SK - Need to make sure to support Caribou. Pastor Schindler(?) provided us with pages of hotels who will not provide shelter.

SR - people are in dire straits. Some burn their bridges. Trash the room. When we put them in, we are vouching for those people.

We are looking at Nancy's request for Caribou (*hotel*) to be sure that is stable. Mentions people who fall through the cracks,

UP1 - homeless are much harder on our trailers than are the farmworkers.

LD - people coming into your shelter are singles, not families. Want to keep young families at risk of homelessness in their houses (rent support).

SR - people that are chronically homeless are very difficult. Part of our prioritization should be identifying the motivated people.

UP2 - so many different issues. Our shelter is full. (*Support Center?*) Sometimes we have to put them into hotels until we have room. It is not just low income housing. It is clean and safe housing. People are now staying 90 days. It used to be 30.

(end of discussion)

11:15 Public Works

BR - request executive session to discuss performance of public employee, 30 minutes (RCW 42.30.110. (1) (g) Conference call with attorney (Rocky). (*Moved, seconded, passed*)

Notetaker leaves until 11:50. BOCC & BR just finishing up...

BR - short week. Attending emergency planning session in Winthrop; so is Josh. I can tell you everything else on agenda next week.

BR leaves.

12:25 - 1:30 Notetaker leaves for lunch

1:37 Planning (*JD not present, SK & RC decide to proceed*)

2016/2017 Budget

Discussion summary: PH notes that two line items are flagged. Funds for Professional Services are 2/3 used at this time. Also, the \$4,500 budgeted for public notices is 85% expended. PH anticipates staying within budget by moving funds as needed.

PH - Item 4: Budget status report. Professional services. Flag - 2/3 of the way through. So far we are okay. The other line (public notices?) a number of things popped up we hadn't anticipated. \$4,500, already about 85% through. Stripped everything out of professional development - will fix that. The other two we need to monitor. Overall bottom line is okay. So far it has been a fairly brisk year for permits (lot line adjustments, feasibility).

Introduces Pam Wilson, Planner 1. Variety of skills - computer.

Voluntary Stewardship Program (VSP) Work Group

Discussion summary: All the slots on the work group have been filled. Jon Wyss opted out of representing the Farm Bureau and was replaced. Washington Department of Ecology (ECY) is assigning a staff position to act as liaison to the VSP.

VSP work group meets Wednesday. Pulled up some examples. They can decide their own structure.

SK - they understand their goal?

PH - I think so.

(1:45 JD arrives)

RC - did we fill out all the positions?

PH - we did. Wyss decided not to represent Farm Bureau. (*Mentions the replacement, didn't catch the name*) Slots all filled, notices sent out. (*Discusses various 'slots' - At Large, Water-shed, etc.*) Phone call from Gary Graff, ECY. They are putting on a staff as liaison to VSP. Theoretically all going through Conservation Group. F&W asked for a seat; BOCC declined. Exchange phone messages with Graff. Don't quite understand the role ECY thinks they are filling. They have set up a weekly(?)/monthly(?) call for various work groups to communicate. Putting together different billing sheets for monthly billing. Work group needs to figure out what kind of help they want (e.g., hired help). Don't anticipate any large expenses that will need to be covered until we are reimbursed.

SK - is the staffer out of Olympia?

PH - think it will be out of Central (Yakima). Will find out, get org. chart. DOE, F&W, Conservation Commission? Will refresh & get you the info.

1:55 BLM planning rules revision.

PH - Embarked on process to revise land management Plan. Commissioners asked for coordination & they did. BOCC at that time did not want to participate. Assume commissioners will want to coordinate with new process? (YES) Will make sure they understand that you want them to coordinate.

1:57 USFS Chewuch travel management plan.

Discussion summary: Discussion revolved around perceived lack of coordination on the part of the USFS and how to respond to it. A two-track approach involving further communication with Mike Williams, the new forest supervisor, and Mike Liu, the Methow district ranger, along with reviewing the draft document to identify objections within the 45 day comment period will be pursued. RC expressed the desire to see the science on the effects of roads on sediment delivery to streams and opined that roads act to hold back sediment and debris. (The notetaker, having 25 years of experience in this area, will offer to provide the scientific literature on the subject to RC.)

Draft plan is out. You requested a variety of documents that they chose not to provide (free expression of staff ideas). Char has pulled up the objection process. 45 days from date of publication.

Char - documents came out on 5th & 6th

PH - have established standing for the lawsuit

AL - Discussion of standing. They have talked with the tribes (YN & Colvilles). 185 page document - no mention of talking with county.

PH - do you want staff to explore filing a formal objection.

RC - I do.

AL - There is a new supervisor. We should take him up on this. There is no mention of the county in the consultation section in the Executive Summary.

RC - Have they been given direction to coordinate from higher-ups.

AL - I have strongly suggested to Mr. Williams that he pay attention to this. Make sure he understands.

RC - first step - letter to Williams, voicing our concerns. He did offer; we should honor that.

SK - he was here two weeks ago and we were very clear, and yet this stuff is still coming out.

RC - previous contact with M. Liu (*inaudible*)

AL - Planning needs to review document to determine appropriate objections. In the meantime, maybe Mr. Williams needs to be invited back. He was here on the first, and this comes out 5 days later.

PH - We'll go through and identify the key points. Want a letter to Williams?

SK - concerned about 45 day time limit.

AL suggest two-tracks: meet with Williams & review report for deficiencies.

RC - haven't looked at report...

Char - 3 alternatives. Chose the one with the most road closures. Believe it was 34%.

RC - Slipped it in a little at a time, then all of a sudden, boom!

SK - they are banking on us not paying attention, but we are.

RC - contracted with environmental organizations.

PH - one issue is that they are tying road closures with timber harvest/treatments. They identified road density. You pointed out that they have taken parts of the Forest Plan...

SK - we want all roads left open until coordination has occurred.

PH - Fair enough, we'll develop quick correspondence (get here and coordinate). On another track, will review document/objection process.

JD - When did they adopt goal to reduce road density? We have objected to that all along.

RC - people objected to that from the start - mud, debris. They would slow down the delivery. Want to see the science. Question that science - who did it. Need those roads for access for fire-fighting. Need to access the resources. They all have a purpose. Put out the money to send an excavator, makes no sense. They listen to Conservation NW (& other environmental organizations) (about wolves, grizzlies, salmon, etc.). All this is tying up into one big scenario.

AL - invite Williams & Liu and see if one person says something different from) the other.

PH - will crank up the invitation, put in a little saber-rattling. Bring later correspondence to their attention.

RC - (*inaudible*)

PH - running list of subjects. Get them in here about transportation. Might go ahead and slide in other subjects, get meetings scheduled. Packer permits, grazing leases, mushrooms, Forest Management Plan process.

RC - If we go down this path and run into the same old story, what are we going to do next?

PH - crank up letter on transportation/objection process. Crank up list of other issues - get commitment to a series of meetings. Set up agreement on coordination process and then proceed with transportation plan.

SK - along those lines, we want the forest supervisor to understand our stand on those issues. Then we want him to take our goals and objectives and then he should make Liu take those into consideration. Don't know how many meetings Williams will come to. Get the big bang out of our buck when he is here.

RC - Michel Balboni came to us and asked about our position on ATV's. If it was legal on county roads then it should be on FS lands. Then it was retracted; not a voluntary decision on his part (it came from higher up). Maybe we can get cooperation from Williams - think he understands, but

AL - his credibility with you is on the line here. My impression was that he understood and assured you that coordination is something he is really interested in. Have both Mikes here. Make sure Liu understands. If it doesn't happen, Williams' credibility is lost.

RC - My concern is that Region 6 will overrule.

PH - corral everybody in the same spot, see who is listening. Will prepare correspondence for commissioners.

EPA/ECY public disclosure request

Discussion summary: PH reported on recent public disclosure requests from EPA and ECY for all county-issued permits on Lakes Osoyoos and Palmer. Discussion revolved around the possible reasons for these requests. The consensus seemed to be that they relate to a possible extension of US Army Corps' Clean Water Act jurisdiction. Commissioners decide to initiate conversations with the Farm Bureau (as a stakeholder) prior to PH drafting a letter.

PH - received public disclosure request from EPA(?) for all permits on Lake Osoyoos & Palmer. Three days earlier, ECY made same request. They get all the notices. Something going on. This article talks about EPA's effort to convince state legislature to extend jurisdiction into local land use matters. Believe the push is on, variety of things happening.

SK - how many permits?

Char - about 12.

PH - Mostly docks & bulkheads. Small amount of fill. One possible explanation is that they are receiving more scrutiny.

RC - It is being challenged on the legal end... (*inaudible*) They are moving up the ladder on this. Trying to connect the dots. How that is going to wrap back in to the waters of the US. Ditches along the roads.

AL - Recollection is that drainage ditches are not waters of the US.

RC - the next step. Step by step.

SK - same issue. Article in Capital Press. Three or four cattle standing in a (creek?)

JD - Amish community.

PH - CAFO (*Confined animal feeding operation*) pops up every so often. In Kittitas, ECY was under contract with EPA. EPA decided they were not performing, did overflights. Seems to be popping up again. 'Navigable waters and associated wetlands' (waters of the United States). Push to extend jurisdiction. I'll go back and gather the correspondence you sent previously... will be the same as now.

SK - Invite ag. Industry into our discussion.

RC - Columbia River Treaty. All wrapped into water.

PH - Not to become conspiracy theorist... VSP, ECY, USACE,... probably others. Want to come up with letter, or do we want to invite stakeholders (Farm Bureau representative) first?

(Yes to discussing with Farm Bureau first)

Forest management - trail maintenance

Discussion summary: Commissioners support Outfitters request to use chainsaws to clear trails into the wilderness.

RC - one more thing on forest management. Our outfitters & back country horsemen asking to open trails in wilderness with chainsaws (on volunteer basis). Signed letter of support. Some FS personnel think it is a good idea. Steve Darwood brought a letter of concern to Liu about the Andrews Creek trail. Lots of deadfall due to fire. Liu responded that maybe they would have to close trail.

JD - Andrews is a vital link. Think it is forest supervisor's discretion to allow that. Fire dispatcher - rappellers are taking chainsaws in to fight fires in wilderness. Don't ask Liu; make it known to Williams about the attitude.

RC - I'll double check with Darwood. Get details.

2:50 Oroville EMS

Discussion summary: Discussion involved how to divide costs between County and City of Oroville for providing emergency services in the Oroville area. Decision was made in favor of County and City contracting separately with Lifeline, according to the current (81% county/ 19% city split), and staying within the funds provided by levies. Building maintenance will be divided according to current split; ambulances will be divided up.

PH - recap to make sure I haven't muddied the water. (*describes old system of finances*). Interim agreement is Cost +10% with Lifeline. Same split as before (81 county/19% city). Costing more. Right now, have negotiated \$12,100/month (city & rural). Derived from negotiations to stay within levies. City is proposing to stay with the same distribution. Still within levies. PH introduced the notion of call volume be used to split costs (60% from city, 40% from rural). Could go with old split. Ambulances split 81/19; county owns 2/3 of building.

JD - only need an inter-local agreement for the license?

Discussion of splitting up, having separate contracts with Lifeline.

PH - levy in Oroville good until 2018. What do you want us to propose on the 17th? My recommendation is to try one more time to come up with joint agreement. Seven year agreement.

SK - I have an observation but it hasn't changed since the other day. In light of other EMS, I have concerns about a joint governance board.

PH - They would be the governing body.

SK - think we should hold back some of the levy for building maintenance etc., contract with Lifeline.

PH - do the math: we will pay this much per month to Lifeline. What I am hearing is that we provide 80% of \$12,100 and pay it to Lifeline (don't try to change split). (YES). We still need an interlocal agreement with city on building. Next step, statement of value for ambulances (three are serviceable). Lifeline will provide ambulances after these are surplus.

SK - that will simplify it.

PH - those are my instructions? Some complications with DOH/licensing. Just have to make sure they understand that there will be only one provider (Lifeline). Would propose a regional license (tied to Tonasket's license). Number of licenses would stay the same. Share this with Mr. Branch? (Yes).

JD - Brad Miller, Ferry County PUD. Called recently. Have elected not to go with the person contracted. They are beginning to look at Lifeline. He was wondering whether it would make a difference with Lifeline - meshing. The halfway point is the Bonaparte junction.

PH - Have my instructions.

3:20 Executive session to discuss performance of a public employee

PH - Ask for 40 minute executive session to discuss performance of a public employee. Ask Clerk of the Board, and legal counsel to attend. (*Moved, seconded, passed*)

Council leave for executive session. The executive session is scheduled to take the remainder of the time allotted for the Planning Administrative Officer study session. Note-taker leaves.

4:00 Animal Shelter Proposal Janet Burts, Daphne Hall

4:30 - Review minutes and approve

