

Board of Okanogan County Commissioners

7/24/17

Chris Branch - CB, BOCC
Jim DeTRo - JD - BOCC
Andy Hover - AH - BOCC
Perry Huston - PH Director of Planning and Development/Admin officer
Angela Hubbard - AH , Planning Dept
Dan Higbee - DH - Building Dept.
Lauren Davidson - LD - Planning Dept. (Planner 1.)
Noah Stuart - NS - Dept head, Jails

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. Some lengthy items are summarized. For officially approved minutes of Board of Commissioner meetings, normally published at a later date, see www.okanogancounty.org.

WEB

1:35 - Only Branch present

PLANNING UPDATE - PERRY HUSTON

1:38 - SHORELINES MASTER PROGAM

Detro enters.

PH - (Passing out document to BOCC.) Angie has put in your changes from last week into your draft. Assuming this is what you wish to do, I will let Lennard know. Step you were in just now: required changes, update from your language attorney's suggestions. At this stage, we have it drafted the way you want it to be. Next step is to work on desired changes. At the point you are comfortable, I will send to Lennard, he will look, and we will schedule next discussion with WDOE.

Angie - We are now in the draft state. Do you just want an OK?

AH -(Was late, catching up) So this is finished?

PH - If it says what you want, we will send to Lennard, he will see if it is ok with WDOE, then on to the next step. Any questions or observations?

C - I had not yet seen the "clean draft." (Looking at it. Wants to see how it incorporates his language, has to find the specific spot.)

AH - It is under WDFW Habitat and Conservation section.

PH - In use chart, Lennard had suggested that if there was an activity not ID'd or listed, that would defer to a CUP. What I would suggest is the language Angie has incorporated. Next step - If it isn't similar to zoning, etc., it is simply not allowed. This is more consistent rather than if not listed, not regulated. If not listed, it is not allowed. All of them are either permitted, conditioned, or not allowed. The language in this is out of the zoning code, so it would be consistent.

AH - inaudible.

AH - Suggests to CB to look at p. 14. to check the changes he had wanted made in the draft.

PH - We do not necessarily need you to ok it today, if you want to take a couple of minutes. At the point you are prepared, let us know.

AH - Question: We have gone through and come up with draft revisions. We now have a clean draft. **When will the public see the clean draft?**

PH - **No additional public review necessary.** You reviewed, Ec'y reviewed. Unless significant changes, they will adopt whatever comes out of next tier of discussions.

AH - **I want a draft on the website so people can start looking at it,** because we have one more round with Ecology .

PH - OK. What we can do: we always maintain a list of people who made comments. We can let them know it is on website. *(Editorial note: it is unclear whether the draft on the website will be made known to the public at large or only to those who have previously commented.)*

CB - It will be interesting to see what ecology's comments are on (?inaudible.)

PH - Other questions? Observations?

Omak Annexation

PH - Sent over - City of Omak is considering an annexation. CB had asked for draft letter supporting that. Housing Authority is property owner.

AH - What is the benefit for them to be annexed into city?

CB - Water rights, sewer infrastructure, etc.

PH - Yes, city zoning is different from county. Only possible due to hookup to water and sanitation system. Adjacent to city limits. It's up in the relatively developed territory by the school. From the standpoint of annexation, it's generally bread and butter. Normally we do not object or comment with letters of support with these.

AH - Curious about (??)

CB - Two things come into play for supporting this. First, it is in the city expansion area as an intended area to incorporate into the city. I assume that map was (Inaudible.) Adjacent also to a mobile home park and in close proximity to urban (??)

AH - So current landowner is petitioning to annex?

PH - Yes.

CB - There are certain annexations I expect to see coming forward. South of Oroville & south of Tonasket - clearly to annex the commercial business. I think the cities really need to step up and have a conversation because our tax base is reliant upon commercial _____. The worse it is ripped away at, the worse it gets. Especially re criminal justice, the more we are chipped away at, the worse it gets in terms of us negotiating with them. We would have to get more \$\$ for

criminal justice. You concerned, because you can see the results of a targeted annexationnow that I am on the 'other side" I can see what is happening. We need to really talk about the "urban growth" (*ie. city expansion*) areasif they are clearly trying to take (pics ?) to get to that one end....it's almost string annexation (annexing only the road) Grand Coulee is a good example of that. It is something to pay attention to. We don't want to have a boundary review board...another level of gov't..... but hard without it (?)

AH - This was the Housing Authority who owns the property?

CB - Yes. They are petitioning the city to be annexed for a low income property.

AH - Where? Right across from Omak school, Robinson Canyon road? CB and AH confer about map.

AH - Asks DeTro if he sees any issue.

JD - I have often stated my view about this. Low income housing....bums laying all over the place, jails full.

AH - i look at it two ways. it is actually them trying to do a low or a ...something a person can't afford through the banks....

JD - if it would function that way I'd agree, but if it's going to be full of bums.....

CB - This one is for homeless families with kids, homeless vets, senior citizens....the primary purpose .

DT - If it is REALLY for this, I'd agree. But if not..... The Pine Meadows did follow the format. It has vets, low income, Sr Citizens - but just a (?) type of a deal?shakes head.

CB - In Oroville, the development community wasn't part of Housing Authority - The impact on the population was almost 100 people. It really served a need county wide, but it brought more low income people to Oroville, but the community was against that. The Housing Authority there served low and moderate incomes.

AH - Verifies it is townhouse style.

CB - The cities denote ...(inaudible.)

AH - I have no problem signing the letter.

PH - The letter I sent explains the process... Lanie can form to your taste.

Lanie - it is before the board.

PH - Hearing is Aug 7th.

CB - Asks if the letter came straight from Perry H.

PH - Yes, 10:00 this morning.

CB and others looking at or for the letter. (They hadn't seen it yet.)

Lanie points to a packet and says it is there.

AH - Takes a copy to read. We need to get going on other stuff.

Woman (Lauren) has entered, sits next to Perry at front table.

Perry passes out a sheet of paper with data to BOCC.

AH - Willing to approve the letter of support for proposed annexation.

JD - Discussion? (None. Approved.)

AH: Asks for a clean copy with no fold. Actually, this one will be fine.

.....

OCC Title 20 Processes - Fees Schedule/Cost of land use activities

PH - Lauren finished the portion of fee schedule for chatter box (??). We will go through and calculate from our perspective what actual cost recovery (rapidly cites a statute - 80.20.20 ?)- The approach is that we show you what cost and what the fee will be. (*Note: They must be talking about applications for building/water. Notetaker does not have copy.*) The ones that are in play are the (?) Lauren will walk you through.

Meeting continues related to the chart. (*Note: Subsequent research showed that this is probably related to charts on the Planning Department section of the Okanogan County Website under Water Availability Applications. But in this case, the data relates to the cost to the county of processing these applications and of holding hearings, which was not found on the website.*)

Lauren: Two (?) are set for hearing for hearing examiner. One is August 10th, but have not done one of them yet. \$300 appeal fee. That time is estimated at \$532. We do not know how much the average HE will cost.

CUP for Cannabis - taking roughly 72 hours to complete, just staff time. She has had to send apps back - taking a lot of hits. \$1500 Av for Hearing Examiner . Altogether \$3,670 - 970 (?)

Water Availability - \$250. If land division, average is \$615. Calculated as \$250 plus advertising and average Hearing Examiner cost \$910.

PH - One irritating part doesn't characterize as an appeal, but as a public hearing. So (inaudible.) I have one scheduled, two in the hopper. I'll have better idea how they will go....

Cannabis ones - part of challenge...may be assuaged....we are having an awful time getting what we can list as complete applications. Everyone is learning together. Eating up a lot of staff time, especially hearings and prep for the hearings - a lot of materials have to go to HE. They generate a lot of interest; there is testimony.

AH - Now, with moratorium, you will not be dealing with as many.

PH - Right. Thursday one was vested. One coming up August 27th that was vested. We will not be in processes for marijuana CUPs for a bit.

AH - After public hearing we can go back ...if a work group comes to gather and gets amendments, etc. That might make less time.

PH - Ok County - has not been recovering costs. In some cases we have come close. These are the fees we have been talking about in re recent activities. We have not put together a resolution orAt some point should create a resolution with minor amendments, and then go to a public hearing on the fees schedule in its totalities, what it costs to do land use business in Ok County.

CV - One concern I have is that there are maybe a few applicants that skew the average.

PH - Yes, some of them....we try not to let the spokes carry things too much in one direction. For every 2 that go smoothly, there is 1 that does not. It can skew it.

CB - 2 or 3...CUP's are a pretty broad subject If you add costs up you (could reach??) \$1800 or \$1900 dollars.

PH - Mini-storage, wrecking yards, gravel pits, some go smoothly depending upon location. The cannabis ones - where we are having a lot of challenge is working our way through the requirements of the Code. Takes a fair amount of time working back and forth with application. It eats up staff time in the beginning, but it avoids being remade and challenges before the HE.

When you go into a lot of applications, you talk about whether it is a complete application, do conditions make it compatible. We had some challenges early on, and the HE said there needed to be better and more complete apps coming in to him, so we are spending more time on that. We send some of them back before going to hearing.

CB - I don't have a problem charging this if there is some amount of predictability in the process....

PH - The cannabis populations could have some impact. *(Note: not sure of meaning.)*

CB - Could make it better.

PH - I we can zero in on requirements, it is easier to write an application if specific.

CB - You have to be careful if you are taking CUP out of the process.

PH - Lauren will go through them....we haven't looked at all of them nor re-calibrated. Will do that. You will see current fee, cost recovery numbers, and then BOCC fills in the blank as to charge.

Nightly Rentals - Fees

Since Lauren is here. ..she is processing nightly rental applications. Any amendments you propose need to go to Planning Commission for public hearing. If you send to PC with instructions, we remand back to PC for their recommendations to you.

AH - In talking to a lot of people in hotel/motel industry and people in community, I think that part of that code is a list...not ambiguous, but there was a group that was left pre-existing, and in this code the way it is written, they are being sunsetted. The way it is written now. In talking with a whole bunch of people about this, I don't believe that was necessarily the intent. I read a lot of LTE's about this, and I would propose to send an amendment to this part of the code to

their review. I think the recommendations of the PC in final form were not necessarily the way it was supposed to be.

I would propose to leaving out the sunset clause before 2005 (?)

Lauren - I think there were 7.

PH - We have a few that came into existence after that. One was successful in getting a rezone to Planned Development (PD). The others are in various phases of phasing out.

AH - These were legal pre-existing 2005.

PH - One thing I would recommend sending back to PC is the while annual permit scheme, the way it is written, does not show whether it applies to the (Methow?) or all of county. Should not be in one code. I you want to be an annual permit, I would put it into business licenses section. The idea behind the annual permit is to get an idea of who is paying taxes, etc. More appropriate as business license, which you have authority to do that, do not have to go to PC. no sense in not looking at Methow along with everything else.

AH - I agree It cleans up the Zone code. This is not the place for business license.

CB - The intent was to see if they were performing well.

PH - I thought it was to be sure they were paying taxes. Mostly to be sure they had UBI namber, doing what they were supposed to do.

CB - So in zoning, CUP's does not like???? (inaudible) If you get a lot of complaints, and investigate....Enforcement rather than annual review.

AH - Asks how Detro feels.

Has to go to PC anyway.

PH - Suggest you ask me to write a resolution to put this back to PC for review.

CB - So when this was adopted there was not opposition to the process? It was fairly heated until the marijuana wave came over everything, and then this was shoved aside. People I thought would come in, just left because there were so many people there. Planning Commission -it was 4-2 or 4-3 vote on amortization clause. The annual review - not so much an issue than the construction of the final code , as we put it together. Looking back, it should have been business license rather than annual review anyway. The amortization was brought to litigation in 2005. County didn't do anything to tie it back to legal nonconforming section of code. According to County's own code, the litigant said, " I don't have to. "The court agreed. We gave a legal amortization period, if you wish to (??) you could, for the number of nightly rentals....

AH - Discussions come up so often about that small section that was being missed. From my discussions with lots of people, I don't see why that was kept in there. I think it's defensible, if it were to go somewhere, I don't know if I would want to...I even read newsletters from people who ran Central Reservations and they commented on it (??) It has been an ongoing thing that people keep talking about. After reviewing that part of code, is it

PH and others - All agree the public review will get into that.

CAPITAL PROJECTS

PH - I sent a week or so ago a draft of the letter which will go to Jr taxing district except for the cities. Cites 36.70 . It goes out, they have to submit their capital project. The county does not sit in a position to approve or disapprove anyone else's capital project. it creates list of all the capital projects being proposed throughout the county. Not other gov't entities, it is essentially just a notification (for?) public review. Code is not up to the point where PC passes on to you re budgets, funding, etc. Once you have a plan, it is enmeshed with your budget project.

CB - So cities are excluded primarily because they have their own capital services plans?

PH - I assume so. They may have their own planning enabling act.

CB - I suggest they be allowed to submit reports of things that are on the line or of benefit to the county. Some school projects. Or maybe they are going to annex, facilities for transportation,, etc.

PH - nothing says we cannot.

C - It would be relevant to county infrastructure , etc.

PH - I can add a section and set this apart from other things.

pH - Because public asks do their own plans, it is not usually in county capital facilities plan.

AH - Where are we with the meshing of such plans?

PH - Sewer line of EastLake is an example. Part of extension was in city limits. That is an example of meshing.

AH - I think it's a good idea if we know what capital facilities will interact with county.

(All bring up other examples of meshing.)

PH - I will go ahead and create a section to include the cities and will send back to you for your review.

CB - Brings up some ways this was done in the past re Capital Facilities plan.

PH - The current annexation proposal is also an example. Could lend itself to a development agreement to memorialize...I will review the record and send to you.

CANNABIS

PH - Hearing is tomorrow. There is a glitch with the notice, which we can fix. You can adopt moratorium interim controls, provided you have one within 60 days. Tomorrow is 30 days. It is still a notice of public meeting. I recommend, depending on what happens if a huge crowd, the work product that you would generate:

A resolution adopting findings and conclusions supporting further process...continue hearing to Aug 14-15. This would also meet our notification requirements. I already have a number of folks who have volunteered to sit on this advisory committee. Fair applications for changes within the existing site of an poorly decent spread to both sides. AH wants to be sure of this.

AH - Since tomorrow's public hearing has a glitch in advertisement, so is tomorrow a study session???

PH - That is like a public hearing. No reason you cannot. Nothing prevents you from getting comments. Use the comments to inform the second set.

There are lots of opportunities to speak. We can hear ideas and next go over the code.

CB - Would like to emphasize (inaudible) This happened with the airport moratorium. There wasn't much opposition to adopting regs for airport....(couldn't follow.) It's like that moratorium because it affects ...if operations are not compliant with existing codes then certainly there is the potential to enforce the codes rather than changing zoning code.

PH - Specifically, in the moratorium I included retail, which I'm not sure the BOCC intended to "capture." Mostly, it has to do with sites that are vested. I will have a notice with these sorts of things laid out so we can go on from tomorrow into the future.

VSP (Voluntary Stewardship Program)

PH- we did get the draft contract. Albert said it's a retake of last year. Tanya - indemnification leans heavily toward the state.

C B - It's pretty typical.

PH - Angie read through last batch of communications. If BOCC prefers to go ahead, will do an agenda bill.

AH says ok.

OCC Title 20/Hirst Issues - Closed basins, well logs, continuity

PH - Have scheduled one of our 3 appeals for Aug 10th. The other two I will schedule for Sept. The reason - we have two distinct issues. Both have to do with closed basins. Both have to do with hydraulic continuity. One is within the mapped portion within the closed basin, but (Aug 10) Ec'y said it wasn't in continuity, according to well logs. Two are outside the mapped portion.

AH - Why did DOE create a different map?

PH - Did a lot of study on water continuity. As you get closer with the mainstem, you are in continuity with the main stem rather than with the stream itself. The timing of pulling the water out, you are pulling from the main stem, not the creek. as you get further away, you are then pulling the water out of the creeks.

CB - Technical issue as to how it plays into Hirst is up in the air?

AH - That's the problem with DOE canceling, it was little benefit. I have a lot of questions from DOE as to why they (DOE) are even issuing letters saying you can construct a well but you have to ask the county before using it The letter must just say you must talk with Okanogan County. The complaint is that the letter comes saying you can drill a well, but you can't use it until.....unless ...you go to Okanogan County.

CB - Chicken or the egg kind of thing.... (inaudible.)

PH - You look at surrounding well logs. Likelihood of finding water, but have to demonstrate availability before building. It is obviously legal withdrawal....it appears you will likely find water, but you cannot get building permit until you demonstrate....(*availability*)

AH - DOE used to basically tell you this is how you have to create a well to be out of hydrologic continuity. In order to be out of continuity, do it this way...but do we come (??too fast, indistinct.)

PH - Since the legislature has one home, I assume we need to get our communications opened up again with DOE.

AH - Ie: Can you stick a straw in the ground? Yes. But you cannot use until you talk to county. What can we tell them?

CB - Must see how deep the well is. ...

AH - Exactly. Go through two confining aquifers, etc. etc....not sure. These are the huge questions that are coming up. People are really frustrated with the fact that Ecy is playing its role, but again, we are the ones saying no, you can't do it. ...etc. Do we ask DOE if it is OK if the people stick a straw in the ground?

PH - We are trying, looking back at Campbell-Gwynn...there are some wells from 1995, pre-Campbell-Gwynn, and so forth....what's the missing piece I don't have, I know people are talking about putting cameras down into the well...we cannot do that. This will pertain to those wells they want to put inside the map of the closed basin. Those are the ones DOE clearly closed. So now well construction becomes the question - layers. We will sort through that ... we can read well logs toowe do not have the ability to go and verify it.

AH - But DOE has the funding to do this. So we are trying to do something. Why not ask DOE for the funding? We need help with this process.

CB - That might be a partial solution

PH - Is there an opportunity to "tag team" it? They can legally withdraw. There is likelihood they can find water. Can the DOE sign off on well construction?? (Avery Richardson...?) Maybe we could cut this deal.

CB - Technicalities. In Oroville, we hired an enviro group with hydrogeologists to argue whether there was continuity, and we lost that pitch. and we determined there was a divide between the two water (??) The predictability of this process is difficult.

AH - it just became for difficult too, with the challenges. It became ..In WRIA 49, you have no closed basins, etc. In the Methow, if you go into a reach, and the 2 cfs applies...

CB - I'm talking about continuity. You still have that issue, don't you?

AH - it was appropriated from the river. But now, with the closed basins, that provides unpredictability.

CB - If the basin isn't closed and it is up a stream that is not a closed basin, and there is no continuity.....

AH - But you are in continuity with the river. There is no interim rule for any of the basins (in 49?) If there is no in stream flow rule, what are you going to do further appropriations by?

If you are out of their boundary, you are sucking water that goes into the river. No matter what, Within that reach, the water will somehow get to the river....and to the ocean. Like I said you can understand, if you suck water out, it will eventually come out of the river.

PH - As I expand my knowledge basis, I have gone through some revisions of the record of decision to some of the wells, we will see if that raises people's comfort level....

I came in yesterday, and trying to bring in different applications that have something in common and trying to work them out and send out the notices in clumps that have commonality. Have not worked on WRIA 49. Trying to keep the crew organized and not crush them. May have to go to where we are alternating WRIA 48- 49 for notices. If I do even one with one WRIA, it is many notices All the same amt of work. Trying to cut them some space to keep workload at even keel. I have 10 on my desk. They each have some point in the hopper. we are not too far out. Some that were up before HE the were exempt segs have not pulled back because they found out they already had a water right. We are right at the knife's edge.

CB - How did you deal with (?? inaudible)

PH - if an adjudicated stream, the surface water has been allocated. no more left. Not closed by rule, but we should be reviewing any additional wells for continuity. should be in a different aquifer. For example, Bonaparte - 60 ft well 200 feet off the creek - we cannot approve. If it s down horizontally and vertically distant, we can make the same pronouncement that DOE would have made 2 years ago, that they are not in continuity. Will that be challenged? Probably sooner or later. Horizontal distance, etc. We have talked without legislature....Whether we do it, or litigation is done for us.

AH- Let's do some theoretical thinking. If someone says yes, I do want to give up my irrigation water right. What mechanism do we use to turn this into a full-time water right?

PH - Water Conservation Board - change of use and place of use change. Kittitas had an emergency rule and Yakima water banking. We use the Kittitas model - when that came through, they were already several years ahead. There were developments that had already done that with water rights that they had changed and used. All they had to do is create the vehicle whereby people could buy a sliver of the water right and move it somewhere else. Takes time. We were engaged 5 or so years ago, had a big drop regarding local water bank. We could try that again.

AH - Well, we are going to have to do something.

CB - Something about putting water into trust.

AH - The people with the most money will buy the water.

PH - That was one of the criticisms in Kittitas. a concern that this would create a market whereby only those with \$\$ could participate in building houses. Legitimate or not, it was a criticism. They have implemented it. The key point is they were years ahead. Suncadia spent years finding water rights, moving them upstream. They gave up a lot of instream flow to get out of litigation with WDFW etc. The water was converted from seasonal water right to year-round

water right. Cle Elum was building a system...there was mitigation surrounding development. They were way ahead.

17.84.400 (Unclear, too fast) - Water ___ bill. I have it tidied up, with Enviro checklist for review and development. Things are going ok. a few hiccups.

Invitation to Secretaries of Ag and Interior

JD - where are we on the invitation to Secretaries of Ag and Interior?

PH - Thought someone else was working on that. I will do it.

Tonasket EMS

No action items. Sent draft to Walker. He has had more success in talking with the phone company than I did. He wanted to make one more shot to see if we can flip it back and do the remodel if I can get a different site, I'll flip it back. I have the contact info from previous director to figure out where the 2005 (??) line went. We have receipt and Rocky could pull it up. We made \$14,000 off it. We need to figure out to whom.

Talked about tax settled property in treasurer's session. The church sent a rough draft. Will double check on the actual tax for the principle.

Energy project

I am told we have easements on all of this. Another chapter closed.

Lake Management District.

PH - we have phone calls, people asking questions. One of the things was having a hearing up there. We have it scheduled here on the 31st. The 8th - City Council, 8th was open, but you, CB, are out somewhere? Am going to check to see if the 22nd....

CB - I will be here that day - I will not be here in the evening. He takes a flight at 7:30 AM next day.

PH - so I will double check on the 22nd. It would give a chance to send a post card out to the notification list. We will put together the venue, etc. 31st - testimony from anyone present, then continue it. 6:30 PM. (Oroville.)

PH leaves, 3:17.

3:18 - All BOCC using phones and computers.

LJ - Scheduling. Next scheduled meeting is with Noah Stewart. Going over inmate account and sample resolutions. He will come and explain why the resolution is being drafted. I am still unclear on the situation and have not completed the draft resolution. Hopefully he can provide more light on the situation than what he has provided to me. Judges are here at 8:15 tomorrow.

Sheriff's office and chief deputies under them are able to meet with the board on the 15th of August. at 3:00. Now that I have them in a 2-hour time slot, I will send an invitation out to other Departments and see if I can get all of those time slots filled.

CB - I won't be back then.

AH - Are you ok with me allocating your portion of the budget? (Laughs)

CB - I think review with them should be fine. It's an initial adjustment.

AH - I will probably ask questions: , for example, " if...then."

CELP Seminar on water:

CB - I have seminar on water when we get back. He mentions CELP (Center for Environmental Law and Policy) and encourages AH to attend. He explains some things about the seminar and tells BOCC what kind of cases CELP takes in the Public Interest. Says he would urge anyone to go and listen, no matter what "side" you are on. Adds that some of our citizens are members of those other camps.

AH - The only thing that gets me is that there is a legitimate argument that one side brings up, but then the other side ignores it. AH leaves.

CB - As AH walks out, CB says: "They are disagreeing with each other, and I want to hear their disagreements. ..."

Conversation over overlays for Critical Areas, Shorelines, Zoning, etc. with note taker, who has asked about overlays being used. It becomes clear that technology has made the planning process, as far as the overlap of various ordinances upon land use, much more sophisticated and much easier to visualize complicated interrelationships upon the land itself for the decision-makers.

ATV/ WATV meeting in Oroville discussion: (Summary) LJ questions note taker about a public records request made this week regarding the ATV/WTAV meeting in Oroville on June 28th. She is concerned that the e-mail implied that she did not do her job regarding legal notice to the public when the meeting was actually on the Commissioners' agenda as a "special meeting," the agenda was posted on the doors of the County Courthouse in Okanongan, and it was e-mailed to certain entities that always get such notices - fulfilling legal requirements for a "Special Meeting." Note taker explains that the concern originated with a statement at a BOCC meeting that they did not have time to publish a notice to the public for this meeting. One concern was whether a quorum of the commissioners would attend and that this information had not been available from the county when the question was asked by citizens. Also, there was concern as to which groups, individuals, or agencies may have received a separate notification of the meeting. It is pointed out by LJ that because the meeting was on the agenda as a "special meeting," the notification requirements for hearings do not apply. BOCC also voiced concern that there was not as much attendance as they would have liked at this meeting, and asks how such meetings might best be announced to the public - all agree that one possibility would be press releases. It is acknowledged by all that publication deadlines of the local newspapers have to be considered - for local weeklies, there is a time lag and it is difficult to get notice out to the public in time if it is scheduled at the last minute. Commissioner Hover offered his opinion that in such cases there should be also be a meeting at the county courthouse, since it is a large county and traveling distances are far for the public if held in a non-central location. AH wants to go above and beyond legal notification requirements. He

mentions that another citizen had written a letter asking that all meetings be known and open to the public on the ATV/WATV topic.

Commissioners' Agenda: (Summary) The notetaker brought up a concern about agendas. The Planning Dept. agenda (*part of Commissioners' meeting on Mondays at 1:30, called a "Study Session"*) is found on another part of the website that most citizens have a hard time locating it, judging from feedback from citizens. Note taker suggests that the published Commissioners' Agenda each week include all items that will be covered during the week (on the Commissioners' website) in one place, so that citizens do not need to search several areas of the website in order to find out what will be discussed during the week. LJ states agreement with this idea.

Noah Stewart - Inmate money account.

(Summary)

Noah has have some mistakes to report. He reports an error of \$21 made by a new employee put into a kiosk and the computer, and an inmate received \$21 extra. About the same time, there was an error involving a \$100 money order. He wants to clear up this situation. This is the process he has to do in order to get the \$121. One of his most experienced officers who never makes a mistake did not catch the other person's mistake. The inmate has already spent the \$\$. A lot of conversation transpires about how the \$100 and \$21 break out. BOCC told Noah how to write it up so that it will be clear to the auditor, consulting with Leah McCormack and Carrie, and the necessity of passing a resolution.

Note taker left around 4:30.