

## Okanogan County Planning Commission 4/7/2021 Special Meeting

### Present

Albert Roberts (AR) - Chair, District 1 rep  
Verlene Hughes (VH) - District 1 rep  
Phil Dart -(PD) - Vice Chair, District 3 Rep  
Salley Bull (SB)- District 3 Rep  
Gina McCoy (GM) - District 2 Rep  
Dave Schulz (DS) (Absent - medical)

### Planning Staff

Stephanie (Pete) Palmer (PP) - Director of Planning  
Angie Hubbard (AHu) Senior Planner  
Morgan Allen (MA), Planning Secretary

*These notes were taken by an Okanogan County Watch volunteer via WebEx and AV Capture. Notes are verbatim when possible, and otherwise summarized or paraphrased. These notes are published at <https://countywatch.org> and are not the official county record of the meeting. For officially approved minutes, normally published at a later time, see [okanogancounty.org/commissioners/minutes%2020/2020%20Minutespage.html](https://okanogancounty.org/commissioners/minutes%2020/2020%20Minutespage.html). Time stamps refer to the AV Capture archive of the meeting for this date at <https://okanogancounty.org/avcapture.html>*

**Summary:** Importance of voting on motions exactly as stated is discussed. It's established that Planning Commission operates with only vague by-laws and loose meeting procedures written in 1971. Reason for this Special Meeting is clarified: a vote regarding the Comp Plan was taken after the meeting was adjourned on 3/22/21. Alternative 3 with certain changes relating to Alternative 4 is selected as Preferred Alt. The record will be passed to Board of Commissioners for approval or changes, followed by public hearing. Importance of agreed-upon rules of operation before important upcoming decisions to be discussed during regular PC meeting on 4/26/2021, followed by work on Critical Areas Ordinance.

**7:02 AR - Begins meeting.** Being a " Special Meeting," the agenda stands as written. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Discussion - you can approve it, if you want.

### Issue regarding minutes:

GM - The minutes do not reflect the actual decision -making that was undertaken at the last meeting. They do not reflect the protest I made about cutting off debate without allowing me to speak. They don't include George's point of order. And I have to say that at this stage, that that vote was not legitimate and as far as I am concerned, we need to select you as our acting chair until we can schedule a proper election.

The election is not reflected correctly, nor is the vote on the Alternatives.....

AHu - (interrupts her) I was just wondering.... if you could point to the line numbers that you want changed or what you want inserted, or.....

GM - I would like.....it's right here .....I would like.....

AR - (cuts her off. ) So do we have a motion on the floor to approve the minutes?

GM - I do not approve the minutes.

AR- Well, we have to have a motion to second.

GM - Oh, excuse me.

AR - To ....

PD - (Taking over.) You can amend the minutes. Ok =- Pete, did you have something you wanted to say?

**08:35 PP** - I was just gonna mention that If you guys want corrections made to the minutes, maybe we should table them until the regular meeting so we can get all this information. because I have a feeling this will be a long discussion and could take the whole meeting.

AR - OK.

PD - I move to table the minutes.

PP (Interrupting him)...and also , if I may, I did listen to the AV Capture for a 3rd time and I did summarize both motions here ...that have the details that may be what Gina is looking for.... That is the first thing on the agenda.

GM - I second Phil's motion.

AH - Ok.

Woman's voice: "What motion?"

PD - OK - I made a motion to table the minutes til next meeting.

AR - Ok there is a motion and a second on the floor to table approving the minutes until our next regular scheduled next meeting.

GT - That's not what I heard Phil say. I heard Phil say to table the minutes until the next meeting.

Is that correct?

PD Yes.

**Importance of stating motions exactly as worded during voting:**

**10:06 -GT:** You added several words to that statement, and you should repeat exactly the motion that's made at that time.

AR - I said that Phil made the a motion to table approving the minutes until the next meeting. Gina seconded.

GT - I heard that Phil said table the minutes .....

PD - til the next meeting -

**10:33 - GT** - nothing about approving it or not .Is that correct, Phil?

PD - no answer.

AR - Well- that's the point of the minutes - the point is approving the minutes.

GT - And adding corrections and all that - that's the process, yes.

AR - So ...you make a motion to approve the minutes, there's a second. Discussion. Then if there is any amendments, additions or corrections to the minutes, those are brought up, and then you agree on those, and then it's approval of the amended minutes. Yes or no.

11:17 GT - My issue is the need to repeat the motion as it's presented.

**11:29 -AR** (with emphasis) We do understand what's going on.

GT -No problem. I looked at the motions that we had last time, and the same thing happened. The motions were not repeated in the same way they were presented, and that led to a lot of ?????So I'm being little picky, and I understand that. But we wouldn't be here under these circumstances, partly, if the motions were stated exactly the way they were presented.

SB - So what is the difference between what you said and what he said?

GT - The way Al said it, we would be voting on approving the minutes next time, rather than discussion, making changes, and then on whether to approve them or not. So there's more process involved, rather than just approving or not approving.

AR - You have a motion, you have a second, it's on the floor, and then you discuss, and then you go. This particular line was not that accurate - and then you make.....all those approving the minutes as modified..... That's the process.

**12:43 - GT** - So what I'm hearing is that if someone makes a motion, then this chair has the right to modify it when they want to.

(Unknown) - Gasp, sigh

SB - I think we are casual..on how we say things. And if there is a question, you can always ask....but approval of the minutes will happen either as is, or amended. And the motion is for next time, the next meeting.... No, George (???) stop that (?)

Thank you.

**Decision to approve (not to engage in discussing making changes, etc.:? Unclear to note taker)) at next regularly scheduled meeting**

AR - Are we done with discussion? All those in favor of approving the minutes at the next regular scheduled meeting, say Aye.

George?

GT - (Pause.) I'm going to vote "for."

AR - OK 4 to 1. (Verlene Hughes opposes.) We'll table the minutes.

AR - New Business: Meeting Procedure tools.

**It is established that Planning Commission operates with only vague by-laws and loose meeting procedures written in 1971**

**14:11 - PP** - I handed out the research I did since last meeting. Just wanted to give you guys parliamentary procedures, Roberts rules of order, some tools to help you guys to understand understand procedural requirements. One thing you need to understand is that Roberts Rules are not laws.....They are simply suggestions on how to run a meeting. The PC has not, from any records we could find, approved any type of procedural things for the meetings, on how you guys want to run your meetings. Like Salley suggested earlier, it's kind of loose how the meetings are being ran, and if there's questions, then you guys ask the questions at the time. I'm also giving you your by-laws, which are pretty vague, so what I would like you guys to do is to take the time to go through all of this look at your by-laws, and I'd like to in a month or two go over all this and see if there's anything you want to add or change, or adopt and kinds of procedures you want at that time.

Question (unknown) - When were these written?

PP - 2/22/1971.

VH - And it's worked all those years! Touche!

AR - Been here since '91. Dave (Schulz) longer than that.

GM - Question - Albert - have you been trying to follow Roberts' Rules or order?

AR - For the most part, you know - working through the motions , seconds, all that.

GM - It's (Roberts' Rules) an enormous body of work.

AR - I don't even imagine even thinking of myself being that much of a bureaucrat.

VH - Even our commissioners don't.....

AR - It works, for the most part, it keeps the peace here ..there have been a few times where we've almost had to call the police here, but.....it works.

**17: 27 - GM -** so basically, there are no rules we are operating under.

AR - Other than the by-laws and generally accepted practices of how most meetings are run, in a somewhat civil manner most of the time.

GM - I like Pete's suggestion - but the way the meeting was run last time was completely trampling ..... You did not allow the debate to continue when it was supposed to. You did not respond to "point of order...."

VH - Excuse me, Gina.....

**18: 09 GM -** Well, No. This was ...the point of order - it is supposed to be answered before anything else proceeds, that's the idea - so you can sort through what the proper procedures are before the decisions are taken.

**AR - OK. Pete has the floor.**

PP - Mr. Chairman, I'd like to continue with my presentation and go into what we captured off the AVC recording concerns that Gina brought up in the e-mails she sent, 3 I think, about concerns ...along with George's concerns. Prompted me to hear the video twice to capture the wording on the Alternatives that were chosen. AHu also went into another room at a different time, and we were able to come up with the same wording.

### **Pete summarizes video of meeting on 3/22/2021**

**19:36 (PP: Summary)** At start of elections, PD made a motion to leave the officers as they are. Salley made a motion to elect new, George echoed Salley, and that it's a regular policy to rotate. There are no policies adopted by the Commission. Discussion took place, Al recognized Phil's motion to leave the officers the same, Dave S. 2nded, discussion took place, Salley suggested to vote it down. Chairman called for the votes by shows of hands. Gina called wait, wait, and expressed that she did not have the chance to discuss and express her concerns. George said that he protests the procedure and a point of order needs to follow normal Roberts rules. Verlene questions George for clarification to nominate each individual and to amend the motion. George agreed. Pres called for votes and addressed the point of order before he broke the tie and voted to keep the officers for another year. There was talk about the process, called for vote, Gina again questioned the process, then expressed she missed the question and then said ok. Discussion went forward to Comprehensive Plan. No more discussion about the election.

**21:09 - PP -** Skipping toward the end of the meeting, when commission started talking about Alternatives and votes, George makes motion for Alternative 3 and repeats, let the wording generate the map. George makes motion to take alt 3 with amendments as a recommendation to commissioners. Phil wants to add using map to Alternative 2. George repeats, let the wording determine the maps. Robert reads alternative as amended. Voting: Alt 3, map 2 voted on. Gina voted no.

AR - Asked for other discussions for the evening. People asking over each other. I talked about what was coming up for Planning Commission. George whether the PC recommendation included sending to the BOCC. Disc took place that everyone understood that the draft would be transmitted.

### **Main reason for this meeting being called is established :**

22:30 - PP - That was the main reason we called this meeting, because the discussion (on March 22) occurred after the meeting was adjourned. We wanted to bring you guys back together. Honestly our heads were spinning after we left the meeting. We reviewed AVC, and questions about the procedure came up and we re-watched it again.

### **23:09 - PP - Planning would like:**

- 1) To project map of the full Alternative that was chosen so you can see it.
- 2) Next, want you to clarify the map that would accompany this transmittal. Planning agrees that the wording in the Alternative needs to generate the map, so a map was generated to go with this Alternative and will share.
- 3) Third, want you to clarify the record of transmittal to BOCC. Planning recommends the comments, alternative, map, Comp Plan, and Draft EIS. Wording of Alt 3, peppered with some things from Alternative 3, and a sentence was removed. Requests direction for staff.

### **Map of Alternative is projected on screen and discussed.**

26:40 - PP - Map displayed and discussed. It is the alternative 3 map, because the wording that was changed did not make a difference on the map.

PD - What I like about Alt 2 is that it caught what was actually on the ground. Yellow is Rural, other is Resource. A lot of acreage is already broken up into 5 acres lots so should not be Resource because it's already developed. The house is already out of the barn. If you designate these lands as resource, they will be in conflict with their designation. Up on Mt. Hull, there's a house on every 5 acres.

All - It is clarified that the map is the vision (rather than the actuality.)

Gina - The reason I voted against the Alternative is because we voted against Alt 4 because there was no map. I thought we should see the map before we voted. But the group decided to go ahead without a map. Are we going to go forward, or what? Are we opening this back up, or not?

SB? - I think we agreed on the wording of the Alternative and the map will be developed on this.

McCoy objects to process of previous meeting: But the vote was taken without a map available. I was the only one who thought we should wait until we saw the map because it had one set of standards for Alt 4, and then we brought another set of standards to bear in voting for Alt. 3. So I .....OK - now we have a map that somewhat matches the words, but the words were voted on already.

PD (?) - So, Pete?

It's clarified that Map of Alt. #2 map will not work if Alternative 3 together with changes is adopted, so the map has not changed from original Alternative 3 map.

33:54 - PP - Technically the map has not changed. Even though the wording was changed, it wasn't significant enough to change the map. This is the map that was presented on March 22. You chose to choose Alt 3 and use Map 2. You can't do that. This shows that the wording of Alt 3 matches this Alt 3 map. As presented on the 22nd. One thing we looked heavily at was urban characteristics around Chesaw area that PHil and Salley brought up about urban characteristics. What we found was some of the areas around the "incorporated areas" are large lots. (Does this include Molson?) A lot of them are large lots. To try to urbanize that, we'd have to chop up large lots. ...so the urban characteristics didn't really match the property sizes. Changes will all need to come with the zoning.

PD - The red area is a lot bigger than the town itself. 5 acres there, which is what I wanted to catch. Will drop this because it can be dealt with in the zoning. But it will affect what people can do with the land.

AR - Pre-existing nonconforming uses.

PD - Summarizes what needs to be decided now.

PP - Comp Plan, DEIS, comments, Alt 3 and map 3?

AR - Do we need a motion to do all this at once, or do we want to break it up?

PD - If someone has the fortitude to do it all.....George, you are on the spot. (Laughter)

38:13 - GT Moves to accept the Alternative 3 wording as passed and transmit to BOCC all comments, the recommended Alternative, the map, the Comprehensive Plan, the SEPA, the record, and the draft EIS. Motion repeated several times by individuals.  
Verlene Seconds.

PD - Is the motion clear enough for the record? Are we clear as mud? Do we want to repeat? It's clarified that the agenda wasn't changed due to being a Special Meeting.

41:22-AR - All in favor of George's motion? Unanimously approved with 5 votes.

AR - Give it to the Commissioners?

Question: Did the Commissioners join us?

A Hu: I don't think so.

41:41 - PD. So...we're done.

41:48 PD makes motion to adjourn, seconded. (*But meeting goes on, instead....*)

PP - (Summarizes) Will transmit Comp Plan to BOCC Hoping CAO will be on agenda at next meeting, followed by zoning. There will be only minor changes to CAO. We are now being pressured by Commerce to get it adopted. It's the same one that was put forward in 2016 - Will send to you again. Minor changes from Commerce 60 day review.

GM - Before we dive deeply into our next round of things we need to work on, I very strongly feel we need to have agreed-upon rules..because what happened at the last meeting completely trampled on the ability of some of us being able to participate fully. And that's the fundamental thing behind these rules is to protect the rights of everyone to be able to do that. So I really strongly want to encourage all of you to look at what Pete handed out - I think it's 2 pages or something. And I strongly want to come to some agreement about our rules so that we can all trust that we are all operating on the same level playing field.

PP - Would you guys want to have it on next agenda.....etc. etc. Do you want one agenda in april for procedures and one in May, or both on April agenda...

PD - Can always extend CAO if we run out of time.

AR - put Critical Areas on there.

PP - Critical Areas and

GT - Would it be cleaner to just have a reference in our bylaws to our rules? Adoption by reference in By Laws?

(No one wants to do this.)

GM - Attempts to speak.

AR - Uses gavel.

46:00 AR - There is a motion and 2nd to adjourn. Should we adjourn and talk about this after we adjourn?

PP - I would discourage that. What I gathered just now was that you want on the April agenda the CAO and the Procedures.

**47:48 - AR: Meeting adjourned.** Now we can talk about .....

SB - No, no, we're done talking.

People joke around ....we can talk about what we want. But it won't be on the record. Chatter, laughter.

Video shuts down.