

Board of Okanogan County Commissioners
7/31/17

Present:

Andy Hover - AH, BOCC
Chris Branch - CB, BOCC
Jim DeTro - JD, BOCC
Perry Huston - PH, Director of Planning and Development/Admin. Officer
Lalena Johns - LJ, County Clerk

This is a paraphrasing of conversations by one of several volunteer citizen note takers and published on the website of Represent Okanogan County (ROC.) Any writer's comments or explanations are in italics. For officially approved minutes of Board of Commissioner meetings, normally published at a later date, see www.okanogancounty.org.

Summary of major issues:

Shorelines Ordinance: "Clean" copy of draft containing required changes will be available shortly to public on county website and to BOCC. Next step is to send to Ecology and receive response; following that, changes the commissioners (and Ecology?) would prefer to make will be addressed. Next Monday (Aug 7) BOCC will discuss current prohibition of subdivisions within the Shoreline and status of "Riverine" designation. Hover makes it clear he wants to go above and beyond mere legal requirements of public notification and opportunity for public input.

Water availability: Summary of how things are proceeding with hearings; Yakama tribe has contested the procedure on 3 approvals, which are headed for hearing, apparently on August 10th; WDOE confirmed August 28th meeting with BOCC regarding Title 20/Hirst issues; County is just barely able to keep up with applications, which are increasing.

Cannabis Moratorium: Discussion of public meeting last week; approval of Resolution# 133-2017. No copy available, but discussion apparently removes sales from terms of the moratorium, discusses expansion of pre-existing sites, and sets hearing on August 21 at 1:30. Branch raises several issues regarding zoning, business, district use chart, and states: "Without raising the issues, and without raising them with some emphasis, we are not addressing them. We need to address them before getting into zoning and comp plans." Citizen advisory committees discussed with interesting interchange between Hover/Branch.

Invitation to Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Interior, and others to discuss wildlife management and other topics. Discussion of who should receive notice.

WATV/ATV plan for District 3: Town hall meeting set for August 22, 6:00 PM, Commissioners' hearing room.

Capital Facility Plan

PH - Sent a revised letter to day re capital facilities plan. This letter will go out under my signature, by statute. But I did make some changes - Idea about invitations? Also, affording opportunity for comment? Commissioners - Any challenges with the content of the letter?

AH - Fine with me.

CB - Ok

PH - asks JD

JD - No, fine with me.

Nightly Rentals

PH - ID's where to put the business license requirement... they are spaced out ...I will walk the language out of 120, I guess it is. Over to the business license section. would create an annual business license, would simply (?) out the amortization. Would also record language re vesting, tie back to pre-existing and ID the 2005 date for legal pre-existing. Trying to prepare resolution to the commissioners that puts it into the review pipeline.

Cannabis (Post-hearing discussion)

PH - I sent over a resolution to follow up on the public hearing on Cannabis. In effect, it amends the moratorium by deleting sales. Any applications for retail sales, we would accept in process. What I did was memorialize the discussion regarding expansion of existing sites. Those activities are within the fenced compound. It continues the public hearing.

CB - Re the business license? 5.06 is where I will put it. You have a few things - there was an empty spot in 5.06.

CB - We might visit this section at some time in the future.

PH - Wouldn't hurt . on another related subject.... example - we have the annual renewal of kennels. It really is not consistent with a CUP - better to have a business license that you can deny or approve. Will pick that up and see what else we have.

Another one...do not recall....some outdated material in that section of code.

CB - Back to moratorium. Did you recall someone testifying re the processing facilities?

AH - One gentleman I know that testified ...about processing facility or...

PH - Our nomenclature doesn't match up with state licenses.

AH - When you make foods....?

PH - We consider this processing. We consider growing and the subsequent preparing for wholesale...under banner of growing. Does not consider value added. We consider that processing, another tier.

PH - There is one process up in the Tonasket area that is under legal pre-exisitng.

CB - In Methow?

AH - yes...

CB - We instituted the moratorium because we received complaints on the growing operations. But how about processing facilities?

AH - I guess I can see zoning ordinance for processing, I could answer better if.....

JD - How many did we get that signed up?

PH - Just over 20, e-mails or signed up. (for advisory committee?)

JD - Is that a good cross-section?

PH - I think so - some named to me, some not. We have some folks that were involved from the beginning, from committee coalition, some from industry.....

AH - I agree with CB about that...New ones coming in from? Conceivably could go to residential area and start packaging. In Winthrop, it is in an industrial section of town. You have coffee, pot, beer, and hard alcohol. Happy Trails road.....(all laugh) I would be willing to look at something like that but want to reiterate that the only reason for moratorium is that the zoning sometimes conflicts with what should be there.

CB - May be quite true. In talking about residential, what are we talking?

AH - R-5 over here. In Methow, it is different.

CB - We have low density residential. I'm curious what we allowed. Suppose it is in the use chart.

PH - The way the marijuana is in use chart....it is in all zones.

CB - There is a huge issue there. Commercial use probably not in every zoning. It takes a bigger fix than that.

AH - My thought is that part of the fix will be some of this stuff.

CB - When you put a moratorium on and people have plans in process...no matter what the business is, you affect them....

AH - Agrees.

CB - What if a winery in the South Methow....you make them stop right there. Affects predictability. Even in farming - if you say farming isn't as showed in....

AH - Let me be sure we are on the same page. Moratorium should not affect anything in the pipeline - is that true?

CB - I you had a state permit already and you are in a banking situation, you would be all of a sudden stopped.

AH - That's what a moratorium does.....

JD - The other thing too is..... and that's why we had the crowd..... I don't understand why we are back here. We have a lot of people coming in with complaints. In one example, there was a physical assault that I didn't even know about. We need to get the guys under control,,, because if we do not....

CB - You deal with them for the crime they are committing.

AH - The faster we can come to a resolution on this....I'll move we adjourn until until she.... (reference to Lanie, who had to leave for something important.)

CB - As long as these business are in compliance with the law....We have a crap pile where stuff is piled in the road..but we didn't put a moratorium on...

JD - But he is just dumping (confusing)

CB - I want to be fair across the board, but if we do not treat businesses fairly across the board, we open door to lawsuits.

AH - I have empathy, but every time we put a moratorium on, and someone comes and complains, we can't just adjust this moratorium for that case....

CB - I want it to be true that in every case we treat it fairly. Now, a lot of people do not like marijuana at all. This county has changed the law 2 times, which means the sand is shifting for businesses. We only have a couple of problems or violating, and there are laws to deal with them.

When you asked if I supported a moratorium, I said yes in regards to growing, but it was posted (*pointed?*) out that some of these are in violations of other statues or codes.

AH - And tell me what it takes to get a new processing operation. (*Apparently addressed to PH.*)

PH - We have never recognized the state's license or the statutes in terms of our vesting. In order to have CUP, have to have state license, but we have not considered state law in terms of vesting. We actually had one go to hearing last Thursday, CUP, another on August 27 that was completed. Have not accepted any since then. In terms again, our line is different from state line for processing, so we do not have any complete or incomplete apps for processing.

CB - otherwise, they would be vested.

PH - Yes. I am working with plans onsite - they have a state license, but no CUP. From his position, they have state plans. Bu they are in violation of local codes.

CB - Moves to recess meeting until the clerk is back.

She returns.

CB - So anyway....

AH - The motion died...she returned.

CB - Back to subject, what are the impacts of a processing facility?

AH - Parking, hours of operation(*lists a number of impacts....*)

(CB - especially in districts where...

AH - if you were to look at any type of industrial processing or kitchen...

Zoning/Cannabis Discussion

CB - I get it. What I didn't notice is that these wound up in every district in the county.

AH - I'm not against growing, I was ... I am not anti-processing. Not anti any of that. I am pro good planning and zoning.

CB - I get it. I didn't consider that bit was allowed in every district in the county. This is "out there."

PH - When we get our advisory committee put together, we'll charge them to:

- 1) Look at general regulations that will apply to all operations everywhere.
- 2) Examine district use chart to see what types of activities should be permitted or not allowed.

CB - Minimum requirement District???

PH - That is the old zone. Still in place on reservation.
All of the rest is in R-1, R-5, R020 ...and (inaudible.)

This was stated with interim zoning ordinance.

Advisory Committee on Cannabis and Land Use Advisory Committee

CB - Who was on the advisory committee?? (Talking of Land Use Advisory Committee.)

PH - Yes, not hooked to marijuana at all. During that time period, we had many attention-grabbing issues and the district use chart didn't get enough attention - nightly rentals, marijuana. Planning Commission did a good job of looking at the maps....

CB - There was an advisory committee.....

PH - Names members... John Wyss, Chris Erlandsen, Dan Beardslee, Haeberle's, Jason Paulsen, John Sunderland.

AH - Exclaims about the expression on Branch's face. "You understand the concerns?"

CB - I understand your concern...I also understand the mess it makes.

CB - An advisory committee...one concern I have , want to be sure there is a clear connection - there is an advisory committee.... we might be sure there is a connection with the Planning Commission when they go to work. This 3rd party advisory confuses the issue if you are not careful with it.

AH - The thing I hope comes out of advisory committees is some self-regulation...(interrupting) Let's talk about light pollution. Some people diffuse their light. When they say it's just like farming, it's not . They are using artificial light. To achieve maximum yield, trying to make \$\$ out of

it....Artificial lighting is ok in industrial district, lighting where people might steal. Out where my house is, it's harsh light.

CB - A lot of lighting I've heard about has been lighting (security.) We have had complaints. Sometimes they are grow lights.

AH - Brings up dark sky ordinance

CB - Why not have a dark sky ordinance?

AH - Dark sky is not just for star gazing, but a rural way of life.... to sit on your porch at night and not be lit up like a Christmas tree. But if I bought a house that was cheap in a lumber yard, I need to understand that there will be noise and light,etc.

CB - Is it still minimum requirement district next to Boesel's (___?) etc?

PH - Don't believe there is any minimum requirement listed anywhere. In the R-1, R-5, R-20....Molson overlay went away, Barnholt Loop went away..... *(speaking of new zoning ordinance)*

CB - In those districts next to industrial, which is an impact to industrial, if those districts are still minimum requirement district and there are a whole bunch of residences, if we talk about ore-existing uses, they will be forced out over time... if 20,30 years, but....

(Couldn't follow. talking over each other. Talking about future problems..)

CB - Without raising the issues, and without raising them with some emphasis, we are not addressing them. We need to address them before getting into zoning and comp plans. I raise all this because businesses are impacted by them,,in addition to residences. I have people contacting me...the moratorium is on, so there wont be a rush of poor choices.

CB -(to PH) - on with your schedule.

Resolution Creating Moratorium

PH - My document will remove sales from terms of the moratorium, will discuss expanding of pre-existng sites, will set the hearing on August 21 at 1:30. You do not have to adopt it.

AH - I would adopt

CB - I would too; it addresses things that need to be looked at.

LJ - Asks if reviewed and then adopted..... or right now?

(No answer notetaker could hear.)

AH - Moves to approve Resolution 133- 2017. CB seconds.

JD - No discussion? Motion carries.

Summary of Upcoming Tasks

PH- I will ship to commissioners when done. (Resolution 133-2017)

VSP also..They are going to cover expenses from end of June to today. This is on tomorrow's consent agenda. VSP work group meetings Thursday. Still need to make decision in terms of the RFQ. At center of the agenda. Will see if we can get them to transmit.

SMP - Clean draft will be sent to you, with changes you discussed. Next step, send back to DOE, sent back to ecology for their review.

Discussion: Shorelines Designations, Subdivision within Shorelines, riverine, Cumulative Impacts Study

CB - One other issue - having to do ..my understanding is that there as two designations for (?) and Riverine that were removed at some point. Some talking the past of the elimination of the rural environment or subdivision prohibition that those were ...could act as a protection of certain shorelines...those have been removed? *(Apparently referring to the statute preventing subdivisions within the shorelines, so that lot lines in subdivisions would not go down to the Ordinary High Water Mark, thus encouraging developers to include a "community" lot that stretched along the shoreline in development plans.)*

PH - I believe Riverine disappeared *(from most recent zoning ordinance.)* The prohibition against subdivision is not there any longer.

CB - Issue in the future - commutative impacts analysis ...the cumulative impact analysis included those designations in the analysis. They were addressing some of the impacts in the matrix used by Entrix. I'd just like to visit back and look at these designations and what they turned into, so we do not get push back on the no longer prohibition of subdivision....

AH - We are the only county in the state that doesn't allow the subdivisions.....

CB - I understand.

PH - I think we took the subdivision stuff into account.

AH (??inaudible.)

CB - I would like to revisit what went away there and how that works. I do not understand how it changed and then how cumulative impacts are now addressed. Need to look at the map to see where they were and how that is. Does not seem like an arduous exercise.

PH - I will schedule that for Monday. Or (???) Why don't we get Hubbard. Will set up for Monday. Will start with where was Riverine, what did it morph into? and the one that addressed the subdivisions, where it before didn't exist.

AH - On the subdivision, I want to speak. I'm fairly adamant about taking that out...or putting back in.

CB - I was involved in a facilitated conversation about this. I was in agreement that you might be able to manage without the prohibition. But it came up that you can make all kinds of rules...it's something I want to revisit, because keep in mind that Ecology would just as soon get it adopted. But others are concerned with what is in it.

AH - I am on same page to be sure what we sent off has been fully discussed as a board. When I talked about building setback and that part, I thought about the subdivision prohibition going back. I am aware of why it is in there - BOCC didn't want anything to do with SMP.

PH - Is there anything else the BOCC wants to look at?

CB - I have all that info, but you don't want me dragging all the boxes out. (Chuckles all around.)

PH - We can pull up the map ..when they changed designations trying to reconcile data we have with the mapping programs we have now. It was a bit of an ordeal, we may have to load new versions...can do.

CB - One issue that came up was the prohibition on subdivision in shorelines...The other is the setback in the Shorelines reservation. Those created the form of a set back. You might see something there that is valuable in conversations in the Methow.

AH - We have the 100 year floodplain (something about Shoeshine CA?) - 100 year floodplain, and the WDFW Habitat Conservation areas. 4 different regulations that work around the shorelines.

PH - We will put this in the study session (*next Monday, 1:30, Aug. 7.*)

Letter inviting Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior, along with others

PH - Not on your agenda - the letter JD asked for inviting USFS personnel to come and visit. I sent a draft. It covers high spots. I remember thinking I would send it over.

JD - If we send another one, but to the Secretary of Interior...Ryan Zinke.

PH - will do.

JD = It's I don't know if we need a list of subjects...Wolves....

AH - How about (looking at letter) how about saying wildlife management issue only?

PH - I will alter it a bit for Sec'y of Interior along with other agencies and send back to you.

CB - I think the language AH mentions is more comprehensive.

AH - I've had raccoon issues ...laughter.....

JD - Wolves are getting hit pretty hard up above Connell (or O'Connor????)

JD - Re cc list: I want Brian Danzel and Skagit, Chelan County (Grizzly issues)....probably Joe, Shelly, Jacquelin?

AH - How about WA Cattlemen's association? When they went to Idaho...

JD - Add Farm Bureau.

CB - King County?

Someone asks, "Why King county?"

CB replies - Management of grizzly bears...they are very interested. Whatcom, Skagit, King counties.

Debating back and forth . hard to follow.

CB - King County requested they be on the list.

JD - Also, Newhouse

AH - Mike Steel, Cathy, Cantwell. All of the legislators.

CB - Do you remember the King County Prosecutor, Jim? The woman who was a legislator? She's the one who brought it up.

AH - Kathy Lambert....Reads over a list of people to be invited. *(Not clear where he's reading from. No environmental groups that I can identify.)*

Water Availability, Title 20 - Ongoing Hearings

PH - Title 20 - Hearing on August 10 - three of them in the Methow. We had a hearing on Thursday on water availability. Still trying to sort through ...land use. Trying to sort through exempt segs. Some folks do not want to go to a public hearing. We had discussed if they are ag only lots, not going to public hearing. We can do with short plants, long plats, you don't record exempt segs to do that well. Require something else, like CC&R's. To me that is harder than going to a public hearing. We are offering to folks as many tools as we can. For example, one person wanted to do an exempt well and sell to a neighbor. He could just do a boundary line adjustment, so that is one tool. We tried that with another, but for some reason they didn't want to absorb the land, so still want an exempt well. Only so many ways to deal with it - either restrict it or go to a public hearing. You may get some phone calls on this.

Every one is getting upset about the time involved. But I think things are moving along as well as can be expected. I am monitoring my crew carefully. They are getting a little BS on this. I still need a meeting with the practitioners. Part of the challenge is that they are not understanding what we are trying to do. A lot of misinformation which is raising the anxiety level., raising anxiety for staff....(???unintelligible.) Something about number of phone calls in the day. Will get a meeting with surveyors, etc and walk them through how things are going.

Will put frequently asked questions on website. We have dealt with the ones that came in before June. We are finished up through may . Well on the way through June. Volume is increasing each and every day.

CB - On the exempt subdivision piece.....they don't think this should apply to exempt sec process? Was this their concern?

PH - In the past, exempt segs were very simple. All 20 acres, Large lots we ran through SEPA. Always with inclusion of public hearing. Tot as simple as it used to be. Folks in the business have proposed that if we are not going to use water, why do we need to go through this process? I say unless you are restricted, we have to assume you are going to use it. The exempt segs - 4 lots or less.

CB - So the progression of exempt segs if at one time 20 A or more, filed in....*(didn't exactly get this)*

PH - We approve, they take to assessor.

CB - What are you looking at?

PH - Zoning, a disclaimer in the case of large lots re roads and where they are, county not responsible. Late lots require SEPA. More than 4 lots. We look at ownership, landowner (& ??)

CB - Water will be involved in all of those, right?

PH - in 58.17 if lots greater than 5 in size, you are exempt from requirements of the chapter, which includes water. About 4 items listed. So in my mind, we never went to litigation, it wasn't till March, etc. The 4 lots or less parallel the exemptions for short plats in statutes. We have argued they are exempt from SEPA too. Are than 4 lots, regardless of six, i do not think they are exempt from SEPA. But applicants argue we are not having to show water for any of these other things.....never got traction on all these issues.

CB - Can't you on the local level for those exemptions?

PH - 58.17 allows for local process. At one time I was of the mind that I wouldn't have to have a short plat process on books, but you are. I haven't found where you have to have exempt segs except 58.17

CB - If you do anything with this, it seems that you could condition it.

PH - We struggle with the instrument with which we put on those restrictions...*(unintelligible.)*

CB - So i guess you do away with the exemption, if you....

PH - We are slowly migrating away. In terms of what it is supposed to accomplish with the adoption of Title 20, we need to try and reconcile Title 16 with Title 20 and all the other things.

CB - The reason I focus on this law is that it has brought us much grief over the years. We have folks complaining that we are not maintaining the roads in exempt subdivisions....all the things that are exempt according to the rule. Nice to not have too many rules, but in the end it costs the county.

PH - One thing the BOCC did a number of years ago... the large lots.. can still do with exempt segs.... Re 10 A lots and boundary line adjustments , can't do any more . Exempt segs you can still do. I don't have a fix to give you at this point. Just wanted you to be aware that the conversions are happening. We are holding pretty close to Title 20, causing some issues.

CB - A friend up around Oroville made a statement who did a bunch of except segs...one of the reasons hehe made a statement he was paying us back for all the exempt segs.. Said you

make the rules, and I make them work for me. For some folks, people think there are hardships, don't think of developer's viewpoint. I'm not saying they are all doing, this, but they are trying to get around this problem we have, for better or for worse. When we are trying to apply looser rules on exempt segs, better pay close attention. One of the reason we have these overlays, etc....if there are a lot of exempt segs, they need water...we'd better pay attention. We should pay attention and not give in ...if we are going this far with Title 20, we'd better pay attention ... do what we are going to do. I do't want to be in lawsuits....we can look ahead & avoid some of them.

AH - We should look at what the Colville's process is for water. They have limited resources but also know their people have a right to water.

PH - *(Something about short plat, exempt seg...what they have done ...about tribe ...they assign land use things to us.)* They have cooperated with my desire that they are in complete control of water. ..they tell me.....

CB - No clearly written water process?

PH - We are flooding the process in the *(IDA?)*

AH - would be interesting to know what the process is. I see that there will bewhen they are approving something over there...

JD - They don't care about that. I can take you down there where the owner of that circles all his water and has applied for another permit to give him. (?) A tribal member. ___? ___ water rights vs recognized water right.

CB - You will find, there will be a different look at water rights whether you are a tribal trust or landowner or not. Not a criticism.

PH - We always defer to them for water within the reservation. We have a form we have been using for years.

JD - That gal over there now? (Lois Trevinos) has been more consistent than most of them in the past.

PH - We still have Pete Palmer as our main contact re land use - Lois Trevinos is the one in charge of water. We'll actually get a decision from each of them on some of our apps. Pete usually decides in terms of agency..Lois Trevinos - have been working with in our first line of contact on water...no particular form, get it by e-mail. But she writes approval. Seems to be working OK. Not aware of any challenges. That's how we are doing the water.

CB - Through the intergovernmental agreement?

PH - yes.

Title 20

PH - We are getting into Title 16, redlining Title 20. Will get to BOCC when it gets done.

Under banner of water: DOE has confirmed August 28th at 1:30 water issues, Hirst.

PH - Admin agenda

EMS -

PH - would ask you to convene as EMS body for approving vouchers. Andy Moves...passes, etc.

Update -

PH - Church that owns the house we use as crew quarters called and asked Lifeline to meet with them about that arrangement .Wayne Walker pointed out with them that was no agreement, that its is with the county. There was then confusion as to whom he was talking with . PH will do some outreach. Don't know what they want to talk about. I went and talked with Wayne about contract. He will make another run at the phone co to see it that's a possibility.

AH - Moves to approve vouchers - electricity, City of Tonasket.

PH - This concludes business.

AH - Adjourns as EMS.

PH - Under banner of “?/ property - Still waiting for rental proposal from church.

Break in proceedings, Misc. Discussions

4:00 today - Lake Management District. Proponents will be here to present. a few slides. A request from Oroville area to continue their hearing to Oroville. Originally thought to be on the 22nd, but proponent is not available so 29th would work better. L J has already submitted hearing notice so not a problem. My staff is preparing a post card to send out. You talked about 6:30 (It's on a Tuesday.)

You will see original proposal, those who signed in support. Anything else you want to see this afternoon? We have some time.

CB - I expect you'll have a map?

PH - Nods head.

CB - We are still paying for everything?

PH - Yes, coming out of my budget.

LJ - We will pay for that (*final notice, I think.*)

CB - Asks about who covers insurance costs.

PH - you can get a bond, recover from 1st year's assessment. Didn't see specific allowance for making an agreement.(*too rapid.*) I can read more closely.

LJ - In resolution....

CB - Could want to converse to see if we are understanding each other. Could be a Port District proposed...

JD - reading from an announcement of some sort revealing that the people involved don't even understand the process.

PH - We could do a continuance mailer...I haven't been diligent about tracking staff....discussion about mailers. Some discussion about mailers - will talk with Lauren about this.

PUBLIC meeting Scheduled - WATV/ATV'S

PH - Putting together a second open house on WATV proposal . Still waiting for Tonasket district to give feedback. Are you still interested?

AH - Probably should.

PH - Whom do you want to organize it? Not complicated work. It is a public works proposal. Will be happy to orchestrate it..

CB - Can you coordinate with public works? I would try to employ any of public works staff.

PH - We have some time this time around.

CB - Who was minutes taker last time?

PH - Lauren. Se will talk with Lanie about this.

Andy - suggests 4th of September. But that's labor day.

Someone suggests 29th?

PH - how about Tuesday, 6:30 PM.

JD - Do we need to go that late?

PH - 19th - Lake District Continuance of today's hearing

PH - Aug 22 - ATV/WATV

Town Hall meeting. 6:00 BOCC hearing room

PH - will publish a notice about this. Will do a paid notice and also press release. He will double-touch with Josh.

LJ - Discussing dates. Should public notice date be the 16th (for 22nd?) - otherwise, the announcement is quite far out ahead. *(It seems they agree.)*

Chatting about Winthrop Mayor status, etc.

LJ - Letter to Board of Equalization - Sally is here today, in case you want to ask her any questions as to that appointment?

CB - Do you know Bill B---?? Chatting about Board of Equalization and composition of Board.

Note taker asks if "clean copy" of SMP draft is on website yet. PH says he will check.

FAIR ISSUES

AH - Fair - turning back check issue. Checks will be canceled because over 2 years old. Awards for blue ribbons? Will be interesting because Fair Adv committee wants to be sure they get enough \$\$\$. There is enough money in those checks to pay for rental of clearing equipment. The checks are 2 years out. AH would like to talk to Fair Adv committee to move some of this \$\$ into Fiarground funds to pay.

LJ - You know their meeting got changed to this week.....

AH -explains again to JD. Tonya and Leahe found those checks (for points.)

3:25 - Miscellaneous low-key discussions and observations on various issues.

Chatting now centers on hospitals.

AH - In August, we should tentatively sit and have CEO's of hospitals come in....Maybe Noah? (Re behavioral health folks who actually get into jail? Because we have to come up with ?? by Sept 15th.)

CB - How about the clinic? A lot of folks involved in it.

JD - Jim and a guy from Mid-Valley - those two guys have some pretty interesting ideas.

AH - I know they do . CEO from Three Rivers - would like him here in same conversation. Mid - Valley CEO has idea each hospital should specialize....doesn't always necessarily work... but if they came to some epiphany ,,,,sometimes if it works, it can really work....

Talk of small population, large county....but not too far if in a central location ...(*appears to have to do with where meetings could take place.*)

CB - As long as hospitals are talking...

AH - As long as we are facilitating. If we believe in the stuff we are doing...

CB - With integration too, the Chelan county - the hospital there.....

AH - For me , to go to mid-Valley - Chelan is almost as close as Mid-Valley.

CB - I almost decided to change to going to Leavenworth because my doctor is there....glad I didn't ...too far.

AH - If they understand we want to bring them into the process.

CB - Part of discussion - integrating will cost, but it will cost anyway. that's the incentive, but what are the problems?

JD - He said something else....

AH - So everyone in Spokane - if only one decides not to go med-adopter??If we decide we don't want to do med-adopt, then no one else can? *Lots of discussion on this topic, whatever it refers to.*

CB - I don't getI don't know why....

AH - doesn't know either.

JD - talking about a woman who knew a lot.

3:40 - CB - I now have a much better idea of what's going on.

People straggling in for hearing on Lake Management District hard to hear.

CB - Ferry county opted into GMA. In this case, its' a little different.

AH - They just came out with the contractors that are going to support it. Just think of that... sounds like they are criticizing the process, not really planning far enough ahead. If not asking right questions...this is all about behavioral health.

CB - There are no answers, just questions.

4:00 - Lake Management District Hearing

PH - Introduces self, passes out packets to BOCC. Materials - Petitions from land owners in Lake Osoyoos area. Where the Lake Management District is proposed.

You have already adopted a resolution of intent that you are wiling to discuss. This is the first public hearing date you have scheduled. BOCC has already discussed - the dates and process. (In "steady" hearing?)

In the statute, WDFW, DNR, WDOE are giving authority. no comments from them to date. Will do specific outreach to them.

To BOCC - Your task today...at the end of your process is to determine if the involved properties will benefit from the proposal. You can reduce the size if some properties would not benefit. You may not expand the District. We have members of the proponents, who are ready to make a presentation.

Gestures to a gentleman who will speak.

Mr. Waterstadt (?) Representing the Association proposing the Lake Management District :

I remember exploring Lake Osoyoos underwater as a boy. The lake has changed. Beneath the surface, there are places where people cannot easily use the water because of dense millfoil. Each year, people get caught in milfoil and drown. A week and a half ago, this happened near Kennewick. in 1970, it was introduced to the lake. Harvesting in Canada has made it worse - it breaks up the millfoil. Fragments in lake ...millfoil weevils. We saw what happens when it is fragmented. It immediately starts sending out roots.

We want to reclaim the lake. from this and pond weed. Property value affected by 15-20 % Predator/prey rel'p is affected. Bacteria attacks gills and fish die, as a result of change in temperature. Dense milfoil patches are mosquito breeding areas.

In our pilot, we were able to propagate weevils, but you need much more. Tried using scuba divers in one area. Also posted signs around lake and informational brochures about lake and millfoil.

From 2013, 90 Acres of millfoil. Now much higher. Will get worse without a coordinated effort. We will always have milfoil. Cannot get rid of it. Using EPA/WDOE approved chemicals. 10 days before application, signs are posted. Day before application, more signs posted on the water side. 2011 - literature on use of herbicides. Have known Impacts on human health. Our hope is that Lake Management District will help cut down on millfoil, having many benefits to humans.

PH - Going to map, properties divided into primary and secondary categories. Charged, budget accumulated over 4 years for eradication of milfoil. Veranda Bch residents excluded because they really have an aquatic weed program. In going through map, determine which properties would benefit. Once you determine the map, people within those boundaries receive a mailed out ballot. Yes or NO vote. If the landowners by majority approve it, subsequent step is to form the district by ordinance. Proposal: One year life. Spent - \$180,000.

Questions: (Map on Screen)

AH - The primary properties - how selected? Proponents might answer. Those that might benefit the most - access to lake, frontage, etc.

AH - in upper left land corner...can't see if they go down into water or not.

(Discuss various lots, pointing at map on screen.)

AH - Primary, Secondary: \$60 vs \$70 assessed. Verifiable access to the water for secondary.

CB - Asks about particular lots, where there is a pond that comes in. But hard to get a boar through. Those folks have access, but if they are secondary it would make sense.

PH - on p. 4 of handout, are the numbers of fees. Budget figures, and so forth.

AH - Per parcel? Correct.

CB - Have the chemicals changed much over the past 30 years? Proponent - changed as we have done various applications.

CB - Is city included in assessment? Yes. Is it adaptive and integrated so it's an integrated pest management?

Proponent: Yes - in the past, we've had 2 different WDOE grants. Asked people if they want to be treated. Today we are talking areas that are difficult to treat. Around pump station.

CB - If weevils wasn't successful..

Proponent - collected to and from Ohio to propagate. To ship weevil, can't work because you can't transmit milfoil across state lines.

CB - Any recoverable costs for county? Has to do with putting on the ballot, etc. Maybe the decision of the board....

Proponent - that's why we said Primary vs. secondary.

PH - Questions from staff? No.

Public Testimony opened. Because only a few people, we will not time you, but if you are lengthy, may ask you to wrap it up.

Mr. Waterstadt - That was my public testimony.

Lee Chapman - Defers on down the line. As Perry went through history and purpose, he covered most things.

One question to answer for Chris ..IN our research, very little cost to county to do this other than administration of the funds. The rest is through the association. The funding, once it comes to the county, you are basically the bankers. We will tell you how much we need, when, etc. Other than that, not much else for you to do. I recognize it's something - another signature, another check .

David Klutz - The contractor for services to Okanogan County since 2014. Bachelor's in Hydrology. worked in CA up until 1998. Wa, 2014 on Spectacle Lake. Have worked on several lakes in county. Experienced in 30 lake groups. Loon Lake, L&B since 1996. Very successful . Can manage their lake, whereas a homeowner vested program has many read that are common areas, where people don't want to pay. We deal with the ecology of the whole lake. I caution you to consider these things:

When set up for invasive places - fragmites in Alta Lake. can be done through the LMD. also. Relationship with Canada. Really pushing in parts of Canada for water treatments. Herbicides instead of harvesting might occur as a result of this. Intakes - "Clipper" herbicide. No irrigation prescriptions. Two of the herbicides are irrigation herbicides. Safe for irrigation waters, certainly should be ok in lakes.

Cam Porter -

Note taker left, 4:30.