

Board of Okanogan County Commissioners
September 17, 2018

Present:

Andy Hover (AH) - BOCC
Chris Branch (CB) - BOCC
Jim DeTRo (JD) - BOCC
Lanie Johns - (LJ) - Clerk of the Board
Jim Potts & Zach - Lobbyists in Olympia for Commissioners
Roxanna King and Angie Hubbard (AHu) -filling in for Perry Huston, Director of Planning and Development (absent)

Summary: Unscheduled legislative update & discussion with county's lobbyists: McCleary; Carbon control, mostly conservative legislators turning over, Indigent Defense; Fires; Orcas/Salmon, etc; Wolves. Cannabis: Public Hearing, BOCC discussion, decision to adopt interim controls; Planning Update: Technical Panel approved county Voluntary Stewardship Plan; County public records request to WDOE for any claims of water rights impairment; Surplus Sale: D. Assmussen; Lengthy informal conversation among Daryl Assmussen, Hover, DeTro, & audience re: the more conservative viewpoints on: wolves, Constitutional rights of grazers, import of beef from Argentina, soybeans vs cows, DNR vs USFS fire management, helicopter shooting of Old Profanity Pack, Upcoming meeting with Regional Forester and (*Commissioners? Cattlemen?*) logging vs burned forests.

1:30 PM - Legislative Update - Jim Potts & Zach

(Not on agenda)

DeTro absent, CB opens meeting.

Jim Potts and Zach (*Note taker's note: The material in much of this conversation is known to the lobbyists, but not to the audience. It is thus difficult to know what they are talking about. They do not go by topic. Very casual, frequently complaints about governor and/or legislature regarding a variety of topics, sometimes involving possible lobbying.*)

Upcoming Session, McCleary, carbon control,

Zach: Wants to discuss the upcoming session. I think we will see a turnover in legislators this year. Some are running, some who are running will not make it.

AH - Conservative legislators going out?

Potts - A lot of them. Every time we have a new legislator, we need to re - educate them.

CB - So more ex-county commissioners in there?

Potts - Don't see many going that way. I always say you should be a local elected official first.

Zach - Made headway on indigent defense. But now we have to re-educate them.

AH - If we unplugged, we could be balanced today.

Zach - Other thing governor does - re the McCleary act and carbon control - will make a difference.

AH - We will spend \$150 - 200,000 on that carbon tax.

Potts - There is a lot of benefit, though

Zach - They tested this year - didn't test well.

AH - had a hard time with them taxing on use and then not providing alternatives. Its' like this push to pull out the Snake River Dams. What will we do with the transportation grid?

Zach - All of it will go on trucks or river. People don't know how much fuel comes up the Columbia and Snake. Will be interesting on county budgets. Data and data mining in (grant?) county.....

AH - PUD has a moratorium on it right now. Infrastructure is that they can bring in the data centers., but not adequate capacity. It doesn't bring in new jobs. 18 month timeline makes it easier for local governments.

DeTro enters 1:35 - I had a meeting I couldn't get out of. Joking around. Chat about weather and fires.

Fires

Zach - Fire response from DNR and others this year?

DT - DNR was fantastic.

AH - communications really good. a lot of people with a lot of info. Not a lot of unexpected things going on.

JD - So far, have not had one DNR fire in Ok county over 20 acres.

Zach - Much quicker response in our area also. Planes came immediately.

JD - that was one of our main white paper recommendations. Increase aerial. When a fire sirens goes off, go to it. Figure out the hierarchy and go to work. Forget about the wind for now. Uses example of a fire with a lot of wind and that one was stopped.

Zach - Pilot lost when he lost his engine. Pilot landed, crash landing, survived. Logging road wasn't good enough, went into trees.

DT - I will always take the reprod over anything else. Except an air port .

Zach - Something odd with engine.

Orcas, salmon, etc status

AH - here will be recommendations coming out. (He is on committee)

CB- Sea Lions is what they eat.

AH - No. they only eat salmon. Sea Lions eat transients.....If they manage increases to hatcheries without funding, WDFW, the PUD's will have to pick up extra cost and pass on to rate payers. No good. We are mandated to try to help endangered species through the Upper Columbia Recovery project. If they start pulling money out of that area, it would have some detrimental, maybe some positive effects up here.

CB - So the issues are about the resident whales?

AH -Yes, because of contaminants in the sound and because they are not getting enough to eat, they cannot absorb contaminants into their blubber. Increase in noise and boat traffic distracts them from being able to feed.

JD _ - (Joking.) Maybe we should shut the ferries down.

AH - Ferries will go to low noise motors.

CB - So up here, it's positive for salmon runs, if they increase production. If they increase harvest - related programs chief Joe can produce 400,000 smolts, and Leavenworth more.... but it will cost for money to do that.

So out of the Methow River, we are initiating (? negotiating?) for 2 dams with our hatchery programs. They are sending so many fish out down our river, but the actual native spring stock is very low. A lot of things up here relate to what they are going to do.

JD - They have cut down on the kills by the excess nitrogen in the water.

CB - We haven't discussed the policy on the condition of the whales - asking for funding.Is it to feed more whales?

JD - Will eliminate some of the sea lions.

AH - You have....I will e-mail you (CB) some of the recommendations. They are for decreasing noise in the sound, increased protection against contaminants in the sound and to increase prey availability.

CB - So what do we want these guys to speak on for us?

AH - We need to set our priorities

Potts - You have the report?

AH - I will send draft recommendations. Finalized Wednesday and I can send them out. A lot of money being asked for.

Zach - seems like a lot should come your way.

AH - Has been a lot of input from salmon recovery board and the hatchery committees. Tribes, etc. the final voting on will be..... until now, it's been a sausage. Throwing all things together . will be finalized by us next month to give to governor.

JD - (still eating lunch - hard to decipher. Speaks of a committee meeting in Olympia.)

JD - Olympia Committee - Wolves

Much of the rest of meeting was about wolves. They got the shoot order while we were in session. Surprising to me that a lot of conversation turned to the ungulate population. The ungulate population is going down and down. I told them I was in high country for 5 days with other jumpers. Not one of us saw a deer or a deer track. Pend Oreille - (*woodland*) caribou - the wolves took them out. They put more in, and the wolves wiped them out. Farmers and ranchers are saying they see no deer, so what will the wolves eat especially if we have a hard winter? They will come to the valley floor.

Are you aware that Colvilles lifted the cap? You can shoot wolves any time, anywhere. That's what Andy brings up at WAG. Come on guys, excuse, excuse, excuse. If they get up to level of a legal take, they change the name of the pack. The Colvilles are changing theirs. They said..... I was there....they said if those wolves start to affect the ungulates which is subsistence for their elders, we will kill them off.

Potts - Plenty of wolves in the area where I used to farm. Zach is telling me that we don't have any deer down there either .

AH - First is (????- muffled.) Public records request is #2. (*meaning unclear.*)

Potts - It will be interesting to see how legislatures will deal with public records requests - they didn't deal with it very well before.

Zach - I'm glad it takes a committee to do what you guys have been doing for years. (Chuckles)

AH - What about the fact that we have 5 states suing us? (*us means Washington*)

Potts - We are the 1st.(?) The other is still going after coal trains etc. (*Unclear*)

AH - Wa state is blocking the new coal transfer station, will probably be sued.

Potts - 6 neighboring sites have sent letters to our state....

AH - Mont , ND, Wyo, are bringing lawsuit against us. 2 other states have joined in. They are saying Washington State can't interfere with this. (*Assume meaning coal transport/transfer .*)

Potts - good use of taxpayer \$\$ to sue each other.

AH - If we had the \$1 million for indigent expense, we could balance our budget right away.

Potts - We are running out of time, and we really appreciate you having us over here.

JD - (*Some joke, unintelligible.*)

Closing - Miscellaneous.

Potts - Keep up the communication.

JD or CB - We talked about revenue on Cannabis.

Potts - the more we hear from you, the more we know.

AH - Nice to take 39 counties, give a million each for 39 counties. (*Referring to the amount to go to counties from state Cannabis tax*)

JD - They had a bill like this but it died. Think of what it could do for indigent defense to do this.

Potts - Tell them over half the other states pay 100 per cent, others, pay 50 percent, and we (Washington) are paying 4 % (*I believe he was talking about the amount of tax \$\$ going to growers and/or production in the counties.*)

AH - Look at the ballot drop box. If anyone can go and put into the mail box, which is what we voted for...now all of a sudden the county pays \$2,5000 each. Must have 2 people go to each box.

JD - Could take half the population to collect for the other half of the population. (*Obscure*)

Potts - Very interesting.

AH - Keep working indigent defense. because that will be.....

Zach -Anyone going to "hearing committee meeting on Friday?" (*Meaning unknown.*)

CB - Yes.

JD - Wolf situation - we brought all the agencies in on the 10th. All agreed on paper that we are correct, in an emergency situation, the sheriff has authority. Health, safety, and welfare of humans does supersede wolves.

55

AH - That's ESA listed, not only wolves.

2:00 Public Hearing, Cannabis 17.290, 220

Rocky - opens meeting. Discusses history, requirement of public hearing for interim control

Options we have:

- 1) Leave interim controls
- 2) Leave controls but adopt additional findings
- 3) Direct staff to write another (*interim control ordinance*)?

Rocky hands out staff report to BOCC.

DeTro - Anything to add?

AH - No.

DeTro - did everyone have a chance to sign in? There are only 4 "yes's " so we will not hold you to the 3 minutes as we do with a full agenda. However, we will cut you off at 5 or 6 minutes

Audience Question- Is there an option to adopt interim control so we can have Planning identify things that need a new look?

AH - we adopted interim control a year ago. At the public hearing to look at new recommendations from PC and Advisory committee, there were still some gray areas. The recommendations that came out of PC and Adv. comm we adopted as interim control because we adopted without a public hearing so we had 60 days to have a public hearing. That is the last meeting . Right now the interim controls in place are the recommendations of the PC etc, not including the Bullit points.

Audience - has PC made suggestions?

AH - That will be a separate public hearing.

Angie - Questions the propriety of question and answers . She says we need to be able to hear the questions.

AH - I would call it clarification

CB - of what the hearing is about.

JD - tells Angie it is being captured.

More people enter.

Aud - the bullit points, are you going to include at a later time?

AH - Right now, interim controls we have in place today are the exact recommendations of the PC (:Planning Commission) the last time. But then the Board asked about 5 items we had questions on. Those 5 points are now with the PC for consideration. Today's hearing is just to put the new interim controls that are the exact recommendations of the PC, in place.

Audience - There is confusion about the exact language.

AHu - explains added language (summarizes) *(I cannot follow and the language is not available visually.)*

Audience - My understanding is that specific language is not what came out of PC.

JD - will clarify. The (Cannabis) committee is an advisory committee, not law.

Audience - of course, of course. That is understood. But there was some conflation between advisory committee and PC recommendations. They are very different - the bond use permit was not a part of the advisory committee.

JD - Let's go forward. we will explain

Audience - We need to know what is being proposed.)

AH - At the last public meeting, all of the recommendations made by PC were put on the screen.

CB - This is a real important piece - what did the publication say this hearing was about??? If it was for public to come and comment, the most important info is what they have read.

AHu - (*can't hear.*)

Lanie hands CB the advertisement.....

CB: "To take public testimony re 2018 (*read too fast to follow*) Most important part - info can be obtained from Okanogan County Planning and Development. People would have had to have called. Reference to code provisions - does not say here is the opportunity to call...

Rocky - all info was on the website.

CB -If there is confusion as to what the hearings are about, the info has been made available. The other important piece is: when we do a moratorium, we have to have a hearing...it's until we figure out what we do. The committee made suggestions, and PC made changes.

CB - and to find it out in detail, you have to consult planning or look at the website.

AH - These are interim controls. We have one more public hearing that will possibly finalize all this.

DeTro - calls on "George" in audience. (*George Zittel*)

George - I think I understand, except there are 5 points you wanted comments on? Can we see what these points are? I don't know what I would be commenting on. I'm interested in what the 5 points are.

CB - During the previous hearing - these points were submitted here, and that's what that hearing was about. (*? No answers.*)

AH says the chairman can open it to public comment.

CB - says the chair can do this if he wants. Appears very frustrated.

JD - This is completely uncalled for. If you have not studied up, we cannot have issues and answers.

CB - These provisions were the subject of the last hearing. We decided to make them interim controls based on that hearing. When people came in.....

Audience - That helps to clarify. If it's just a yes or a no vote

CB - A yes or no on these interim controls - or do away with Interim Control!

AH - The 5 points on here have nothing to do with this hearing.

JD - Now ,opening up to public testimony.

Matt Friggione - Was a part of the committee. We spent a lot of hours on that , a lot of thoughtful time, we had basically the whole group agreeing. I do believe they are all reasonable. My recommendation is to take it back to committee. It would be nice to be a part of it. The newer issues are not about a lot of things we can't figure out. I recommend we go forward with what we originally worked on. If you want to address the 5 topic in it, it would be good if we could meet on that . This is apparently not the time. We were trying to reach consensus, a mutual agreement. We are hoping to do that.

John Willet - Mazama. Thanks. I sent a letter yesterday. from Mazama. I am a major investor. I have been listening to Matt. Thanks to him. He and the others really worked hard. it was a great compromise. Happy to see it being considered. I am concerned that there are additional (*bullits?*) I agree with Matt - these should be sent back to committee. They have a very diverse membership. Then it can come back to you. One of the things I've always been concerned about - ag and smells. (???? me this is a (??) to get rid of cannabis. If we regulate smells, we will be regulating our cattle, chicken farms, etc. etc. So many things. A slippery slope from the start. Must be very careful about smells and agriculture. We don't have a lot of employee opportunities. We have 15 jobs, in the summer 30 jobs. That is just us. It contributes to our economy. Not into Seattle, but back into here. I'll bet you wish you could have some of the state money. people think we make so much in the cannabis business - we barely make ends meet . a lot of businesses are going bellies up because of the taxes, fed and state. Would really appreciate it if you take that into consideration when you put on more regulations. It could drive the business out of the county. Thanks. Glad you will consider the 5 questions separately.

George - George Zittle... I was on advisory committee. I initially thought it was really good. Back and forth, coming to consensus. At some point, the growers realized that if all of them attended the meetings, they would have the majority to any vote bring cast. At that point in time, the back and forth quit. Things came upOne time, three growers surrounded a non-grower and didn't like what the was saying and told him he'd better go along with the marijuana group. So the idea of sending it back to the same committee will not serve as an equal discussion between 2 groups.

Also, Marijuana keeps wanting to be treated like agriculture, but the state says it is not in the same group as agriculture - not considered ag by the state.

Kelsey Taylor I was going to talk about the changes, but I feel I need to address the accusations of Mr. Zittle?... At first, people thought the committee wouldn't go anywhere. While the meetings were lively, they were respectful.. Mr. Zittle, you did not show up for the last month (*he says he didn't think it was worth while*) we did do a lot of comprising because of your concerns. I also ...*talks about Mr. Gray....*who was on the industry side of things - I think that our debates were respectful, so I encourage you to talk to the other folks on the advisory commttee...someone like Andy Irvin.... I didn't agree but we were always respectful.

Other comments - CUP for farms in R-1 is in much of the county. The majority of the county is in R-1, these changes have brought up backwards not forward. The reason we wanted that was to have a good compromise in farms feeling comfortable here. With the new R-1 provisions, we have gone backwards. We have had a respectful dialogue. Willing to discuss again. The CPR item needs to be discussed again.

Dave Sorenson - Winthrop. My concern regarding the options being considered today Opt #2 - leaving it n place but adopting additional findings. Can only assume this has to do with the areas for additional review. Bt we have no idea what those findings are. We don't know what we are commenting on. I am concerned about putting everything into conditional use process. We got past that with a lot fo compromise. This process was fairly respectful for the most parts. I am a little dismayed to hear Mr. Zittle's comments. I request that you

leave the interim r in place as is and remand the whole discussion back to the committee. Or at least ask the planning committee communicate with you. These 5 issues encompass all of the main issues we were directed to work on. Not a couple of little things that you don't have concerns about. It's basically throwing out all the work we did. Confused. Missed last hearing, but not possible to be here. Don't know what else to say.

Jeremy Moberg - Riverside. Agree with Dave's comments - seems like a complete review of all the work we put into advisory committee, which I thought was a great civic process -

JD , you expressed surprised that 2 sides could come into agreement. It was long and exhausting. Weekly meetings for months. We determined there was no way too use the zone chart - unless you want to push us out into...immediately clear to use we could not use the zone chart to do that. I was quite worried about the interpretation. I think we are here because we don't have a definition. If you read the definition, it is not that easy to tell. For now, leave the interim controls in place. I would have liked an option to leavethis was a busy time..... fires around us.

I would select #1, leave interim controls in place. #2 has no language. No findings. we can't even tell what it means - no language. How could we even adopt this? I do believe that we should give respect to the time we put into this. It should be remanded to the advisory committee to address issues or to know why they were not adequate. Are there issues that came up to determine they are not adequate?

The only way it will probably work is if we have overlays. That is the only way you will have understanding among the public what and where things can be implemented. R-1 is everything - it's all ag land. Doesn't work.

I recommend #1 - remand it and reconvene the advisory committee and have them work more more closely with planning commission.

JD - asked new comers if they want to testify.

Bill wants to. **Bill Johnson, Green Acres road.**

On the 5 points, I have comments on 3 of them. Has lived on Green acres Road before Green acres was there. The lighting - my wife and I were going home on evening, the lights at the grow were so bright that they automatically triggered the automatic lights. Impact of odor - sometimes we cannot sit on deck in evenings, and it doesn't matter what side because the wind variesit's on both sides of us. There is tremendous amount of traffic - the police should be paid for by the industry. Huge amount, very distressing.

Public testimony closed

Board discussion:

At last meeting 4 members of PC were here. We are not in this public hearing now about these 5 points. If they want to talk with us about this, they are more than welcome to do so.

So we are here deciding whether to leave the interim controls from last year in place, & whether we now keep the interim controls now in place that the PC made. The R-1 zoning and CUP (*Conditional use permit*) seem to be the biggest problem.

CB - 3 options are on the staff report. It's not the old interim controls, but those we just put in. The other one: In a sense, I do not totally understand this the way it is written, but do additional findings of fact, and then ...Angie (to AHU)- you might adopt additional findings according to what you heard today

CB - We need clarification on this. There is Ordinance 2018-12 - are we asking whether to adopt this along with additional facts?

CB - I will not consider this one because I don't know what it means.- It is clear that the people here are objecting how the PC recommendations came to us. But we had a hearing on those recommendations. But I am getting a message saying we should have adopted those, but I'm also getting a message that you didn't like those rules. In fact, I'm hearing that no one liked the files adopted at the last hearing.

We thought it was pretty (?)to adopt those in the interim, there was no protest to those rules. That's complicated. We felt comfortable with what came to us, so we wanted to adopt and then bring up other things in the future. I'm thinking that keeping the interim in place was pretty good.

My thoughts: what there is today, we move forward with that.

AH - So, we keep the new interim controls that we adopted 2 weeks ago??

CB - Yes - the only additional findings I have is that there is confusion as to what came to us at the last public hearing. It acknowledges that what we looked at it and didn't adopt, there was disagreement, and we just found out about it today because no one said so at the last hearing.

JD - Confusing parts: At every public hearing, it always comes up and refers to agriculture. I will say it again. This is not agricultural related. People refer to them as pot farms, but they are not. The initiative by the state - considered it a controlled substance. IT IS NOT AG. I do appreciate and commend that those of you do realize that the county is not making a lot of money off this. We would love it if the state would step up and that we, as a legislative body are going to help the industry and the citizens \$1,000,000 for indigent defense. Also in the testimonyand some people are talking...you are confusing the Planning Commission with the Planning Dept. Today, if we do as we are talking about and indicating the direction we want to go..... If it goes back, it is not going back to Planning Dept, but back to Planning Commission.

CB - Another thing. Whether anyone thinks it should be ag or not ag, The way the zoning code is made, it does not have a consideration for this kind of endeavor because our county is mostly agricultural. The fact is, that it is really hard to apply the kinds of rules we are applying in the way our zoning code works. We don't have industrial or commercial areas, to look at our zone, it is hard to tell where this fits in. It will be difficult to address this issue quicklywe really need to fix the code. The comp plan and zoning does not lend itself to the kinds of uses being proposed today..R-1 used to be minimum requirement district, so to make it work, and believe me I worked with it before. If it were pretty R-1, strictly residential, I think we remanded this back because it is very difficult to resolve this. Also, we remanded it to see if the Planning Commission actually have the input. PC looks at this, and they should refer to...

JD - they did that...Yes, they did IfPC can put it back to advisory committee.

Rocky - Perry did explain to PC that they would speak to the Advisory committee and there were favorable comments.

CB - I would leave it at that.

AH -We are a legislative body. If this goes back to PC, we will have one more public hearing on this. And so to have it go back to committee, the points on here were pretty specific ...not broad- based things.

Are we ready to????

CB - I adopt interim controls as proposed. Unanimous.

CB - Thank you for your patience. And something that Andy mentioned - if you want to ask questions of us, it's a legislative, not quasi-judicial matter, but we have other things to do now.

AH - If PC gives us a recommendation and we think it's not quite right, we can change it.

Audience - Asks how to get minutes of last hearing, since they all apparently missed it.

Some of the points are read out:

1. Lighting - they brought up that lights should be pointed downward but with a greenhouse, there was nothing about having a time they should shut off. If in an actual building, it is not much of a concern.
2. Noise - PC referred to our "noise ordinance." Our noise ordinance is such that anyone could call and lodge a complaint. We don't have a ton of..the majority of farms....are they needing to run generators all night long?
- 3 . Density - a Tier 3 is 30,000 square feet, but why would the liquor control board put on these controls and then allow 10 farms to share space?? (Jeremy - it was production controls, canopy controls.) AH -annual total production
- 4 It looked like marijuana is being allowed to flower all year long. Right now, there is a time frame this order exists. Just like feed lots, etc...baby's breath.... Jeremy and I talked about an orchard using chicken manure. Is this a reasonable use? Is it industry standard? So this question might not get answered by PC.

Audience - the odor, during harvest time or whatever, when they are using a greenhouse all year around, you get the odor...we even get it in the winter when they are growing.

AH - wasn't there something about a filter?

Aud - It's usually fall when the smell permeates. In the summer, sometimes you do not smell it at all.

Jeremy - very few people are flowering outside the normal flowering schedule. It correlates as to who is bringing in the most \$\$ and has the most employees,. It is less than 5% of the farms.

5. Traffic - I brought it up regarding processors. We have 15-20 cars parked there. I want this taken into account if you have a road that can't handle a lot of traffic.....

Jeremy - with apple harvest we see this. I have parking arrangements at our farm. We are different because we are not harvesting all at once.

AH - So you mitigated.

Tracey - This was addressed and discussed in committee....a lot of compromises were made.

Ah - So could we say this doesn't need to be addressed?

Tracey - that would be lovely.

Aud - It is density related.

AH - so you would have to have 5 acres or whatever before too densely populated.

George - I remember the zone 1 issue. Perry explained that to us. There is a ton of land that is R-1. You would naturally think this is land set aside for growth. I agree with the marijuana farmers. The growth pattern of this county will never use up all that R-1 land. That's why in committee we opened up R-1 with some definitions.

JD - The R-1 came when they thought there was going to be a ski area.

AH - Good that we adopted the interim controls, because that is a CUP on a 20-acre piece zoned for R-1. But that can change, so.... but I did not see that in the language. So those are things that you guys should talk to the Planning Commission about, for mitigations.

Jeremy - do you want to see an overlay? The definition is complicated.

AH - And overlay would be the best way to do it. Gives example of Pine Creek. If you were to draw box around, it and say that within this box we will not have farms..that would be the best way to do it.

Aud - A bit of argument from audience.

JD - we have a lot of overlays anyway. It gives us a boundary to look at and identify.

Jeremy - I would identify the high density areas and designate a CUP or whatever.....block out the non-permitted areas.

Aud - at the beginning, we realized how strenuous this would be.,, and identify where it should not be. and on behalf of a definition.

AH - So on long plats, there are conditional use permits. So people, in trying to go through that process, people have to meet the conditions. Some can, some can't. If I were going to look for property where I want to grow marijuana, could I go into the Planning Dept and ask what the typical conditions are, could I meet these conditions? It doesn't matter....

Jeremy - short plats were blocked out - others say there was a density requirement.

AH - some things audience is saying would be better included.

Rocky - says people should come to Planning Commission meetings on the 4th Monday of every month. They can write a letter to her - Rocky .

Jeremy - would love to work with county at state level..... give the money to the counties that grow it.

JD - talks about a person who asked what the commissioners are doing with the 7 million dollars they get off marijuana? Had to explain that we don't see it.

More discussion about next steps at state level.

A few people from the hearing stick around for the following discussions.

Angie - Perry Huston's Update list:

*News- Technical Panel approved the county's Voluntary Stewardship Plan

*Public Records Request - Impairment claims? *(Huston wants direction from BOCC in order to write a PRR? The county is planning on filing a Public Records Request to the WDOE for documents related to any claims of impairments to water rights. Apparently county has requested this info time after time and received no response.)*

AH -I could call Trevor up and ask about impairment claims, but do you want to go back to 1976 to the In-stream Flow rule? AH - maybe 1998? Do you want them for both WRIA 48 and WRIA 49? *(Does not appear to be totally resolved.)*

About 3:00 - The conversation turns to Darrel Asmussen (DA) in audience, who is apparently contracting for surplus auction. Branch not present.

DA - wants to talk to DeTro and Hover about the surplus sale: They tell him now is ok. (Branch has left.) JD says to go to Jeremy.

Question - where do we put this stuff that the departments bring us?

JD - are you talking about when you want bundle stuff? Put out on dirt?

LJ - Everything is going in commercial building.

D.A. We do need someone to be in charge, for us to go to.

AH - for our surplus auction?

D.A. - doesn't work in commercial building.

Detailed discussion about many aspects of the surplus sale.

JD - whether or not minimum bids are going to be considered?

JD - could come to the clerk of the board.

Conclusion, to give committee clarity - AH asked Lanie to go back to e-mail from Sept 14 send to Jim and David. things need to be signed to approve details.etc.....

AH reads state laws. "May set" minimum price.

(There are personal priority contract agreements. Assumussen & Dagnon for auction. Contract. also between county and Campbell Auctions Auto.)

After 5 or 10 minutes, it becomes a meeting among Asmussen, DeTro, and Hover, regarding the more conservative viewpoints on: wolves, Constitutional rights of grazers, import of beef from Argentina, soybeans vs cows, DNR vs USFS fire management, helicopter shooting of Old Profanity Pack, Upcoming meeting with Regional Forester and (Commissioners? Cattlemen?) logging vs burned forests. -

DA - Asks JD how the "Tri-County " meeting went. *(Does he mean "Quad County?" Also known as the Eastern Washington counties)*

JD - They got the shoot order at the time, and the helicopter was going to fly on the (?) pack - later identified as the Old Profanity Pack. Permits - a lot of folks are not going to get their Doe permits because there are no more ungulates. The only deer people are seeing are in downtown Conconnuly. If we have a bad winter, the wolves will be on the valley floor.

DA - Thinks in the 5-8 miles stretch from Twisp to Pateros, it will be feast time for the wolves. *(Does he really think it's 5-8 miles? By HWY 153, it is 33.4 miles)*

JD - I said that a lot time ago. It is here now, in our county. At least we don't have endangered species like sage grouse, etc.

JD - on reservation, they can kill any wolf, any time now.

DA - Did you discuss Colville Forest Plan (at Tri- or Quad- County meeting?)

JD - Have you seen that? It's huge, 3 volumes, plus addendums it will be as bad to read as Obama care.

DA - It will be like the Blue Mountains. You guys will be faced with it. Quite a ways out yet. That, and then just what we were talking about same as Kalispells and Spokanes. Their hunting rights will affect us. But its not in the plan.

AH Why this this a big issue?

DA- we are talking about use of the forest, it's getting to be a bigger and bigger issue. It's not a Treaty tribe it's an executive order. Rules and regulations are a lot different. 15 years ago they didn't answer it. (?)

JD -there is a jurisdictional difference...the Colville is not a treaty tribe as far as formation of reservation, but they can have a treaty. When they opened up the Bridgeport deal - when I was talking to them...we had a lot of discussions with the Colvilles before we got a treaty (re fish.)

DA - this weekend when they shot the wolves?

AH - OP pack - Old Profanity Pack - they are going to "take care of" it this weekend.

DA. there were stipulations put upon peoplecan't turn cattle out until July 10th, 15th. They tried to do that in the Methow, but we got it changed.

Now - 10th-15th of July now, in this one. Another one - you have to pick up and remove all dead animals,, and it was their wolves that killed them. One other stipulation..(it's going to come home.....) Dave Duncan ...Ferry County - a public land guy and Cattlemen's Association. Gary not up on these things. Gordy was, but not involved.

AH - I am on Wolf Advisory Group....(names a bunch of others)

DA - It has to come out of an organization to you...or game commission - the wolf committee ...they are taking away personal property rights.

AH - I think the argument has to be different. It is a personal property right....I totally disagree with what they are doing....a wolf- lover would saybut we have to feed the American people.

DA - the USFS giving that right to the Indians. In 1905 - the grazers, the permittees, it gets to almost a constitutional issue -

JD - Taylor Management Act

Daryl- "Split estate," Theodore Roosevelt. A constitutional right that grazers have.

AH - what was permit assigning a value for someone to put their cows in?

Unidentified man in audience - my permit went to 1800's or so. Guadalupe treaty or agreement...the well water, land,,etc ...they gave woods to people to populate and use it. it's not a right...it IS a right....but we are only there as a lessee. In (?) law. There has been a lot of money left.....I was on a legal foundation for several years. (*Difficult to follow train of thought.*)

AH - What is going on with cattle people in Montana /Wyoming? Any change?

Darrell - A lot of cheap money coming in and buying pieces of ground. We've seen it here in our life. How we went from a family farm to a bigger and bigger thing 30-40 cows a good living. now 4-500. Don't know if better now or not.

AH - How can it be better...if we are bringing beef from Argentina. In my opinion, the costs for American producers are higher than the costs for those in other countries. Folks in the country value the environment, so how can you say that we want to take cows off our rangelands but we are still going to eat beef from those other countries where they don't have those laws?

DA - and all diseases ...hoof and mouth disease That will kill our industry. There is no such thing as Fair Trade.

AH - The soybean people are the ones whose lobbyists got their product out of the country at the expense of someone else.

Daryl - It's a one way street - these soy beans have been well taken care of since 1932. They really don't underhand free trade. Soybeans - the most share of each dollar ...they get 86 cents we get (6 cents?) Now we operate on DNR range permits. We've tried to get the the formula down so ti makes sense.

AH - On permits right now, it's about 8 (*cents on the dollar?*). A few years ago it was 13. USS is about 220. Put together in about 1960. Some far-sighted individuals there. DNR is pretty well insulated.

AH - We got an invite out to the Regional Forester. Will be talking with him about our Forest Plan.

DA - I want to be there when you talk with him.

AH - When we get a date, we'll have to put that out. Got rid of Pena. Mat is leaving Tonasket. Tells DeTro to go to the "party" (?) it's at noon, and you bring your lunch. In Wenatchee, when we consolidated, all it did was (*insulate?*) those folks away from us.

AH going to fire meeting tonight: Crescent 75% contained, McLeod 95% contained - meeting tonight probably on mop-up.

DA- I want to have Andy there when Hillary comes. Very approachable.

AH - It's tough . she wants to get somewhere but knows political constraints

JD - She has really listened to us on putting out fires. She listened, and look what she did with the floods when the governor thumbed his nose at us.

DA - Talks about a meeting awhile ago. talked about rapid response - a tremendous cost.

JD - we are doing cost comparisons all the time, comparing cost with benefits. Cost of Crescent fire as compared with what DNR has done. Taking care of it is fractional compared with that.

AH - I saw the cost list for aircraft, a page of tickets for flying in the Team.

DA - The overhead...local folks may be extravagant, but the Type 1, Type 2 teams - 66 people sent in to Tonasket to the school, but none of them got within 40 miles of the fires. Two weeks later, 66 more came in. Not a damn thing they do. Look at all our friends...they have piles of money and don't do nothing. Go to a fire and don't do a thing. These expenses have to be stopped. We agree we have to do something.

AH - Go the other way, so that Crescent fire ... a lot of it was up for a Forest Service sale. You'd have people making money, you are (thinning?) out that resource so that when the fires comes through you can protect a resource. if you look at the cost of the fires, you have to look at what the resources were that were burned up.

DA - This endangered habit is gone....lynx here, sage grouse in Oregon.

AH - worst logging operation would look better in 5 years than how it looks now.

4:15 - Note taker leaves. Paperwork being signed among AH and DB in re expenses.