

**Okanogan County Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
June 28, 2021, 7:00 PM
Deliberations on Critical Areas Ordinance and Public Comments**

Staff attending:

Pete Palmer (PP), Planning Director
Angela Hubbard (AH) - Senior Planner, Planning Dept.
Morgan Allen (MA) - Planning Dept. Secretary

Planning Commission Members in attendance:

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

Members of Agencies and Public tuned in:

Scot Kuhta - Dept of Commerce
Jim Gregg - Mazama Advisory Committee
Connie Iten - Washington Dept of Fish and Wildlife
Claire Bunny - Mazama Advisory Committee
Isabelle Spohn - Okanogan County Watch
(There may have been others who did not speak up.)

These notes were taken by an Okanogan County Watch volunteer. Every attempt is made to be accurate. Notes are verbatim when possible, and otherwise summarized or paraphrased with note takers' comments or clarifications in italics. These notes are published at <https://www.countywatch.org/> and are not the official county record of the meeting. County videos of these meetings are usually available the next day at Okanogan County, WA . Times indicated in the notes below can be used to locate each conversation by checking the clock on the wall of the commissioners' hearing room on the video recording in full screen.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT DISCUSSIONS

The Planning Department summarized information on the Draft Critical Areas Ordinance along with comments from government agencies and public Comments on the ordinance in a Staff Report presented to the Commission. The Department recommends that the Commission deliberate upon these comments and the Draft CAO tonight. The Department would then make revisions to the current Draft. Comments from the Washington State Departments of Commerce and Fish and Wildlife in particular have highlighted the need for substantial changes in the Ordinance. Reference to some of the same necessary changes were made in public comments. Procedure of the meeting is discussed and debated in regards to discussion of public comments. Commission member Gina McCoy presents changes she thinks are needed and highlights important public comments she thinks need to be addressed. Other Commission members take turns making more general comments upon the document in regards to such items as: organization and understandability of the document; Buffer Averaging; Hearings Examiner vs Planning Commission in the Appeals Process; need for Clearing and Grading

Ordinance; need for updated Best Available Science, Aquifer Recharge Areas, importance of enforcement of County regulations, Geologic Hazards and Liquefaction and more. The Department will make revisions pursuant to this discussion and written comments and the new Draft will be discussed by the Planning Commission in a public meeting on August 23, 2021, at 7:00 PM.

Terminology:

PC - Planning Commission
HE - Hearing Examiner
BAS - Best Available Science
HCA - Habitat Conservation Area
DBH - Diameter at Breast Height

Meeting of the Okanogan County Planning Commission

7:01 - Meeting called to order (some items already discussed.)

AI Roberts - Motion for Approval of the agenda.

DS - So moved.

AR - I guess there are no additions. Approval of the minutes....

GT - Moves to approve under condition that grammatical and spelling errors be corrected.

Motion seconded and carried.

7:05 PM - Planning Commission Deliberation Upon Verbal and Written Public Comments, Comments from Government Agencies:

Discussion of how the meeting will proceed and Planning Department Recommendations:

AH - Pete is attending remotely on phone. We are done with verbal testimony and written testimony. Comment period is finished. Purpose of today - for our need to deliberate upon the comments that has been received.

AH - Staff report is in the record, has comments and response to those comments and a recommendation is offered. We can go through comment response. Based on the comment received, recommendation is to make additional changes to the document. I have not made any. I recommend that after you have deliberated on the comments, if you may feel as a board that it warrants changes to be made. Then I would like to basically revise the draft.

AR - Then we'd have to come back to it. But not the public comments, right?

AH - More than likely, yes. Because the changes would be substantial.

7:06 - PC Comments on organization/formatting of document:

Definitions and what we are addressing at this point.

PD - I'm aggravated - 2 or 3 pages of definitions at the beginning of each chapter. Can't it be in the back instead? Is there a reason they have to be this way?

AH - I thought there was a definition section. There were some criteria. One comment was the organization of document makes it difficult for the general public. Normally there is a definition section with all the definitions.

PD - Seems like all of them do that now.

AH - The reason for that is that the Shorelines Ordinance was inserted into the ordinance. To migrate all those definitions into the CAO of the time would have been difficult. Normally there is a section with all the definitions. reorganization of the document would be a good comment to make. There is no rule as to where definitions need to be placed.

SB - Comment to Phil on definitions if they are at the end. That's why they are probably at the beginning.

Discussion goes on as to where definitions should be and size of type to make it easier to follow.

AH - Those could be recommendations as you go forward. No rule as to where - but you have to have definitions.

GT- Many Comments were specific and to the point, and someone put a lot of work into that. We need to express thanks to people for all their hard work that guides us forward in making a good document.

GM - Some of agency comments were submitted several months ago - you made changes - so the draft we have is somewhat modified, but not on the more recent comments. Somewhat confusing. Is this True?

AH - It went out for 60 day review. Before public comment. We met with Ecy and I think WDFW before we wrote this. I had about 2 days to fix changes as to what needed to be changed.

GM - But this summary of comments and responses are dealing with this this round of comments, and not the earlier comments, is that correct?

AH - Correct.

GM - "Comment noted "- does this mean you note it but do not agree?

AH - No, not at all. Maybe I didn't know how to respond.

PD - That's up to us (PC) Laughter.

GM These are really detailed comments, takes a lot to absorb them and know how to respond.

AH - That was a reason for my recommendation. It needs a lot of work - more than we can do in the next 3 years and go through section by sections. That's why I said maybe we can go through and address major comments, put it together and bring it back to you. That's for you to discuss. I'm not trying to push you into doing something.

7:15 PM - Questioning deference to Commenting Agencies:

DS - The commenting agencies Not all is always accurate. You know the land better than some of the agencies. Gives an example where the DNR forgot about a water fall, and we saved them something like a million dollars. Antoine down by Chelan - example - big cracks in ground after earthquake. There are some times that our experts don't know something. They might be from out of the area. They won't go out and walk every inch of it like we do. Some things the experts don't recognize. Mother Earth is in control. You get people from some of these committees, they don't walk every inch of it.

VH - Good point, well-taken.

7:16 PM - Need for Document to be user-friendly:

PD - One thing I'd like a lot clearer - outlining when this applies. The document does this piecemeal throughout. This CAO doesn't apply to a lot of stuff. When you try to do a development or any change near water. Doesn't seem to affect single family homes.

AH - It does impact even building a garage,, etc. . . . anything needing that permission. Triggers a review. Level of review depends upon which Critical Area also.

PD - You don't see much about single families, etc. If there was some way to get a deal any time you are in a Critical Area, you need review.

AH - It is in here. Definition of "development."

PD - I'm looking for a document for "dummies." Can I put my deck next to the creek? If there was a paragraph you could go to. . . if you are doing anything within so close to the water, etc.

AH - It's in here - but I agree that there needs to be some educational materials along with it. Like a guiding document.

7:18 PM - Buffer Averaging and Appeals: Hearings Examiner vs Planning Commission

DS - I'm not working with all these documents every day - how do we get into buffer averaging? It's complicated, but I'd like an illustration. Also, do not like it that everything goes to the Hearing Officer (*Examiner.*) I understand that, but we used to do Timber Open Space, and we knew a lot more about that than the Hearing Officer does. Saves time for the applicant, but there are times when the PC completely gets left out.

AH - That was one comment, and I checked the Hearing Examiner code and there is a conflict because I checked the HE code, and there some problems. housekeeping that needs to be done. I do not believe Title 14 is listed under what the Hearing Examiner hears. Another reason we should spend little bit of time on it .

AR - When someone comes in for a building permit, their plan should be put up against zoning, shorelines etc. all of them. But if someone comes in and does some work ahead of time and

then goes for a building permit but it doesn't work within the regulations, it's not the county's responsibility to hold their hand and fix it for them.

PD - Just trying to make it easier for folks to know when they have to deal it . You learn where to build houses and not to build them by experience. For example, someone built a beautiful road up the hillside, but there was no base - the first time it we have a spring runoff he'll have a huge ditch. He couldn't get it.

7:23 PM - Clearing and Grading Ordinance

PD - Most of grading/clearing ordinances they are talking about are in conjunction with Shorelines, CAO, etc.

GT - We see people doing such things, and that IS HAPPENING. And this stuff will end up in Critical Areas. Important to get a handle on this.

AH - Pete is in process of developing a Clearing and Grading ordinance. Maybe she can speak to this?

DS - 30 years ago we started on this. It is difficult to enforce, etc. One of the most. We haven't done well with it. We need to do better and to make it work.

GT - It affects the neighbors too. It doesn't need to be onerous.

PD - But you also can't take the rights away from him - property rights.

GT - So the next door person must suffer ??? You need to wait for the cliff to fall for that person to exercise their property rights?

PD - Umm, hum.. Yep.

VH - This document does address the rights of property owners. They do have that right. But there are standards to building roads at Public Works that they hand out. Culverts, etc. But if it's on private property and it's not part of a plat they have the right and we can't do anything. And this document will not address that.

7:25 PM - Explanation: Hearings Examiner, Best Available Science

PP (*requesting to be heard.*) Good evening. I wanted to kinda butt in here to answer a few questions and try to explain better. I believe one of PC was asking about Hearing Examiner vs PC. Felt PC was being left out. Difference in the 2 bodies. PC is in advisory capacity. HE has authority to make decision. This is why some would go to the HE rather than PC.

Also - where it says "comments noted." This comment could have been a repeat of other comments or a property owner's opinion that didn't warrant changes to the document. Big reason for Planning Dept recommendation to turn it around and make substantial changes: we heard over and over in comments but mostly WDFW and Commerce that we need to include

more of the BAS. **That was the big reason for recommendation of the Planning Dept to include these in the document.** That's all I have for now.

7:29 PM: Gina McCoy Comments:

AR: Gina?

GM - Seems to me we need to see what the Planning Dept comes up with in terms of modifications in response to these comments before we can go a lot further. I have a couple of....

AR - (interrupting) (unintelligible.)

GM - I have suggestions of my own, but (fading in and out with mic.) I want to note that one comment noted where it says the county should require bond, etc.....should change "may" to "shall." I don't see that as something to which you should say "We heard you." It's one of a number of comments about this.

Will we go through the document now? I have a list of observations. Are we going to go through the document or wait until we get the changes?

AR - Angela said "deliberation," so we should go through them. (*Comments?*)

SB - The same thing is said over and over....comments by WDFW, etc.

AH - I listed comments and put numbers on comments. So WDFW has some the same as Commerce, etc. Remember that BAS is being included in all as being necessary.

PD - Wanted to say CAO is very important. But as we deliberate, every time we set a buffer zone, etc. we are eliminating people's rights to their property, but don't want to make it impossible to do anything if you have a creek on your property. You could take away 90% of their usable land. Have to do our best to control damage without stomping on people.

Also, the way we have worked in the past, this board's whole purpose is for us to tell planning what we think. Am I wrong on that? We make the recommendations.

AH - Usually

7:35 Comments on Process of addressing this document:

PP - I'll interject there. Usually it's the Planning Dept that makes first draft based on laws. In this case, BAS should have been included. Then the PC reviews draft and says what changes they want. The outcome would then meet the basic standard of what the laws are requiring. This is what we've done with this document - tried to do this without infringing on property rights.

AH - If you look at the timeline.....2009-2013: PC did that. Certain sections were highlighted, but the whole document wasn't considered, necessarily. They didn't look at how things affect each other. I'd like to revise it the way it should be and then bring it back to you.

I have been working on this for the whole time I worked for OK County, and that is 13 years.

DS - Wait until you get to 40-50 years!

7:36 - Best Available Science Discussed

DS - Pete, you mentioned BAS. I don't agree with the idea that BAS is "dot, dot, dot."....you (*a builder*) should be able to hire your own people to contest what BAS is. I like the part about challenging BAS..... but it's costly. And you don't know what the result is going to be until the very end.

GT - So adding BAS needs to be done. Any other things that need to be done?

AH - All comments should be considered, evaluated, and incorporated...lost my train of thought..... There's a lot of things..... that it is not that we just want to do WDFW habitat, or.....that's what we got into last time....need to look at the whole document regarding organization, BAS.....so a landowner can pick it up and understand it. There's a lot of things - we don't want to do ONLY WDFW, etc. The whole document needs to be looked at - BAS, user-friendly, etc. Etc

GT - Should we entertain a motion for the staff to make these changes and then we need to review it?

7:40 PM AR - Don't know if we need to go that far. If we don't.....it means Angie does the work.....extends it by 2 or more months??? Ith. f we don't as a board say what we have seen, that means that if Angie does, then we do it again. Could extend by 2 or more mon

GT - I've heard Angie more than once ask for our thoughts.....

AH - I have started a list, though

GT - We could be more specific.

GM - People need to know what these things are being decided upon.

AH - Let's go down the list, then.....we'll just go around the table.

7:41 PM - PC Member Comments

AR - Let's start with Gina.

7:41 - Gina McCoy comments

GM - Want to agree with Dave - BAS is a pretty slippery thing. It's important that there be a working living bibliography of BAS that needs to be continually updated so people have an opportunity to know what is being decided upon. A lot of work. All I can tell you is that as a natural resource professional. BAS is never enough. It's not a fixed thing. There is always more.

A bunch of comments about "may " and "shall: " I Would like to see how this plays out. I share some of those concerns.

P.. 4, under "C" description of maps and HCA's - there's a lot in here that should be identified, but no reference as to what expertise is required to do thatleaves someone hanging and not knowing where to go with that.

P 5, #4 at the top - referencing channel migration rates, comparing aerial photos between 1954 & 1998, graphs of '54 and '98.....these seem out of date. I'm sure we have more recent aerial photos more recent than that.....

AH - Gina - I wanted to respond. The CMZ - That comes from the Methow study and study done in the Okanogan. That's what they did to come up with the Channel Migration Zones. We had 2 studies done for the county.

GM - That's fine, but they were done a long time ago. And they are talking about the procedures for evaluating Channel Migration Zones.

AH - That comes from the guidance by Ecology. That's what they used for those studies. Are they outdated? Yes. Hopefully we can get something newer.....maybe there will be grant money.

GM - Fine. Ok. You are saying it's out of your hands right now.....

7:45 - Dart (Interrupting) Questioning Process

PD - You are looking at CAO right now, right?

GM - Yes. That's not what I'm supposed to do?

PD - Yes. Do we want to dig into the document or talk about comments and outline the changes we want to put in for Angie to work on? ?

Sal - I think AR just asked our opinions on what we want....He said Gina was first.....asked us to express our options on what we want.

PD - We may take all night.

GM - I understand. I don't have a huge amount.....

GT - That's why I thought we should get started.

GM - I don't want to take up a lot of time. I don't have a huge amount. But I did read the document and I did take notes. If you want, I can yield the floor.

AR - I think Angie has the comments. I suspect that some of your notations on the ordinance are similar to the comments. So if we can.....

AR - Well, the fact is that Angie has the rest of the comments. It's what you perceive the ordinance to be, you can incorporate that into your comments. (unintelligible).

AH - It's up to you as a Board as to how you want to proceed.

AR - I would think that the substance of the ordinance is more what we should be dealing with, not the comments.

PD - I was just thinking we could go through the changes and say yes or no...that would give Angie direction to change how the comments are driving it? Wanting to wrap my head around where we are going....All I was looking at. Not trying to be difficult. I think I'm coming at it left-handed and everyone else is coming at it right-handed. So no big deal. (Loud laughter.)

GM - For me, as far as the comments are concerned, I kind of like what the staff has put together but would like to see it translated into the document & would like to see it put into track changes and would like to know the outcome of the "comment noted" response. A mystery to me right now. What does the response translate to in the document? I do like how this has been summarized for us. I've got a handful of what amounts to technical criticisms or comments that were not brought up in the public comments.

AR - Good. Why don't you continue with what you have on the ordinance itself, and then we can just go on and

7:48 - McCoy continues with comments:

GM: It won't take long, I promise.

p. 22 - Item #7 - "applications." Don't see why all evergreen trees bigger than 8" and deciduous under 12" diameter) should be "shunned (?)" Not understanding the logic there.

p. 23, #1 - CAO Report requirements shall demonstrate that loss of habitat functions that cannot be avoided....etc. Are compensated in order to gain no net loss. Who determines what Net Loss actually is? Who has that technical expertise? You need to know a lot of things in order to do this.....

DS - Gina, on DBH (Diameter Breast Height) - That is the forest service, and that is the DNR - You don't cut anything bigger than DBH That's the law.

GM - Oh, Ok. I understand there are laws....a little hard to understand the rationale.....

GM - I would like to see across the board how the may's and shall's play out. We need to discuss this among ourselves when we have time to. It's pretty important.

GM - Was looking at a bunch of comments from Futurewise on Aquifer Recharge Areas- I want to concur with them . I hope those will be addressed effectively. Also, p. 30 on classification and rating systems.

GM - Jumping to p. 34 - under Riparian Assessment criteria... whole thing about site ass't of the riparian areas....to be conducted by Admin or the designee another place where you need a qualified professional .

SB - So you want the county to hire someone for that position, is that what you're saying?

GM - I don't know, but what I do know is that there is no point in doing it badly.

AH - The applicant would be required to do so. A qualified professional.

PD - The way we originally had that set up was someone does that in the Planning Dept goes out and says either everything is fine or we need to hire someone to prove you are ok doing it?

DS - That was our intent.

AH - Wanted to point out, Isabelle having a hard time

GM - Sorry, trying to talk with everyone, which is facing me away from the microphone. With that, I will yield.

7:52 - Salley Bull Comments.

Ok my comments are general. Start with recommendations from Commerce. They are telling us whether we are up to state standards. (And??? Fish and Wildlife??) Next, Check with Yakimas and see if we have their (??) described correctly. Because it's not. They are concerned about habitat areas that should be in there. If you handle that part, you have most of these comments addressed. I think you really do. And someplace in life a Grading ordinance - Not sure if it goes in here. Especially roads. All agreed that we need it.

7:54 - George Thornton Comments

Like Salley, I'm not as specific as Gina. We'll get to those. Do think that the long-term ability to have enforcement - strikes me as across the board ..not just CAO.....needs to improve, in even just noticing there are problems. Getting the info to start with . le - people building without permits. Solving problems at the beginning, instead of stopping problems is the best remedy . Agree if we go along with the agencies in meeting the legal requirements..... Understanding requirements is basic, will g

7:55 - Dave Schulz - A comment for George: Remember the Rocky Hall Fire?

GT - I was in it, thank you.

DS - What was the problem with all the landowners trying to rebuild? They didn't have septic tank approval, building permits, somehow we need to emphasize you may not pay today, but you will pay in the end.

GT - Agreed - Need to find a way that all the county rules and regs are paid attention to. Not necessarily punitive. It needs to help people to do the right thing. Getting the information out is part of it. Try to prevent problems rather than stomping on them is the best remedy.

DS - But it's our job to emphasize that if you don't do this and this, it could cost you down the road. That's what we need to be doing.

GT - My house was in the geographic center of that fire. But we put in a septic tank, we put in a water system, we put in a (?) road, we put in metal sheeting around the house.

PD Your house survived, right?

GT - Absolutely.

PD - Because I was a there. I never did hear - never did get back to your house to see if it made it. Personal question.

GT - DNR came and did photos because of all the right things we did. They wound up in some pamphlets. That said, people up there - it's a financial issue too, It's not all of the people don't want to do the wrong thing, but it's expensive. can't afford..... I would rather see them there than on the street in Seattle. I don't have an answer.

PD - We tried to get an enforcement officer. There was quite an uproar. The time is probably right to do that again. Someone within the PD who is dedicated to doing that. Not run around and inspect, but if there is a new problem, go out and work with the people - not necessarily check for all building permits. Example of the sandbag house - big stack of flood debris where they built the house. Won't stand up to flood. It's their problem but if you have a document and they build there anyway....

DS - There's a house in the Methow - the river runs under it.

GM - Where is their septic? Does it not hurt anyone else?

8:00 - Verlene Hughes Comments

VH - Overall, I thought this was pretty good. There is a few things wthat will be gone over and things that we might change, that shall and shall not be. We can be as careful as we want to with this. this is our job. Dot I's and cross T's. And get this out to the people . Biggest thing is that through the permit process and the inspections, Once this document is signed off on by Commissioners, who is going to do the inspections and make sure the 28 pages or what have you is being followed by the developer? That is something where we really need to reach out to Planning and other departments and make sure that happens.

DS - Verlene, remember the spotted owl? We weren't allowed to log our property. Lots of things have happened in the last 20 years. Game Dept came and apologized - you no longer have any spotted owls there. We didn't know, but you could have went ahead. Somehow the information that they had, if they would have told me sooner, I could have went back in and re-thinned it, and logged it, but it didn't happen.

VH - However, there's still signs that it's Spotted Owl habitat.

DS - You don't hear it like you did then.

GM - And that's an example of Best Available Science not being updated. You should....

VH - When signs went up, they said "That is not Spotted Owl habitat." But the signs are still there. We can make sure it's in black and white and available to the public.

DS - Do you think it's Spotted Owl habitat now?

(Laughter - it burned.)

8:02 - Dave Schulz Comments : I'll be quiet.

8:02 - Phil Dart Comments

Habitat Conservation Areas: (HCA's) needs a change in wording. P. 30 , classification rating system. Level 2 Habitat...lists a bunch of stuff. Concerns listed. Since this document was developed, there is more Like the Loon isn't there, it's ow Endangered, Sharptails are endangered. Some need updating. Should say 'At this time they are...." and "check document for a complete list." We will never have them all.

SB - Those are just Level one.

Discussions of levels.

AH - I think there are issues with this. It's one of the areas that needs to be worked on. Level 2 was "species of local concern" (mule deer, etc. important to us) ...the previous Level 1 was supposed to contain threatened,, endangered , and sensitive species. Federal and State.

GT - Maintained by the Natural Heritage program.

AH Usually from WDFW and US Fish and Wildlife.

GT - What if a disagreement between US FW and WDFW? Last week, they put out white tailed ptarmigan, but state not going to do anything.

AH - Is this species here?

GT - Yes, Just an example that there can be reasonable disagreement. One of my jobs was this for USFS. There are issues out there. What will we do?

AH - If federally listed, they are under the Endangered Species Act, which applies.

GM - I would think it would be everything on both lists. But state may have something that is more sensitive than federal list. So we will still include that.

PD - Level 2 habitat....what animal is a "cliff?"

AH - That's a habitat type .

(People talking over each other laughing .)

PD - We need something adopted that is explanatory. Want to reiterate. Here's a perfect example - A developer said "If you give us 50 foot buffer, we will do "x,y,z. " But the state never did that (*paid them back.*) No money has ever been given. Perfect example of BAS, great intention. Buffer is there, they promised not to log it if they were paid, but legislature still has not paid. All the good intentions in the world sometimes have bad outcomes.

GT - so the problem is those we elect? (laughter.)

DS - Example of timber stand improvement. Fire in the Twisp River - big fir, 20 inches in diameter. The money should have gone back to the schools. They were going to give all that away. Same way with DNR. What did they do, they raised our taxes more.

PD - Best intended plans do not always work out. Need to be careful.

8:14 - What is an Acquifer Recharge Zone? What are Critical Aquifers?

PD - What is an aquifer recharge zone? To me, a whole watershed is an aquifer recharge.

AH - A lot of comments received talked about aquifer recharge areas. You will see RCW's I gave you. There are minimum classification requirements.

PD - I don't have a picture in my mind of what an aquifer recharge zone is.

AH - That is because there was no change from the 1990 draft. One of the things that does need to be revisited.

DS - Area of Weiman Bridge to Mazama Sub Unit A - the whole thing is an underground lake. They couldn't drop it down even a fraction of an inch. I used to check that as a county commissioner. But I don't think we even have a record of where the wells are anyway.

AH - I do have a copy of a document -

DX - Do you know where the wells are?

AR - Any area where the water sinks in before it evaporates should be aquifer recharge. Some areas do it better than others.

PD - At one point, I'd like someone to explain what it means.

GM - As a hydrologist, I agree. The big exception would be - Take away the impervious parts, some parts of these watersheds are dry enough that essentially no water that percolates through becomes groundwater in significant quantities. Those would be the only areas that wouldn't be aquifer recharge areas. I agree it's a very broad term and hard to do anything with.

PD - Are they all critical aquifer recharge zones? Or is just the one you want to build on critical? Our water up in Molson comes from the Cascades. So can we go tell the USFS what they can do in the Pasayten Wilderness that protects our groundwater?

GT - Explain.

PD - They did tests with dyes. It showed up in the Molson area. I read the study it when I was in high school. Remember it well; they put radioactive dye in the water up there and flew over it to see where it went. No one said anything about it to people who drank the radioactive dye. The groundwater pushes up from the North Cascades. It talks about how the ponds are low until the snow melts, then they fill up. I Government did the test. Will look to see if I can find study.

AH - Varies from year to year.

DS - Columbia study says it comes all the way up and affects the green bridge (Methow drainable)

More discussion on rivers and geology.

GT - where is the connection between the Highlands and the Cascades?

AR - we digress.

SB - Your turn, Albert,

8:19 - Albert Roberts Comments

AR - I have nothing to say.

AR - Angie - do you have enough info between the legal requirements and our comments here to streamline the ordinance to make it readable, understandable, and enforceable?

AH - Yes. I will do my best.

8: 20 - Maps

DS - In reference to the Comp Plan, the maps we have - I think there are 15 or 16. Someone else said 13. How many maps are there?

AH - Do you Mean Critical areas? (Yes.) They are in the back of this, but this info needs to be updated.

AH - Critical Areas maps? This info will need to be updated also.

DS - Do you have trouble interpreting the maps?

AH - Well, it's a very large county - people will have to -The actual data comes from WDFW. Actually now you can access that.

AR - If you look at a map in a township, the border on that may vary 20 miles. It's a tool indicate that it's sort of in here...may be something to look into.....on the map, you need to look at the key to see how accurate concise the map is.

AH - Can get the details from WDFW now has an online map and tools.

DS - Has all the dates and how they are developed? (Yes.) I did not know that.

AH - So this is more of a visual, how it looks, (????)

8:24 - Geologic Hazards and Liquefaction

GM - Geological hazards and liquefaction? Is this a new category? Previously it was landslides. Are we adding to the scope of geological hazards?

AH - I believe the liquefaction is sort of correlated with earthquakes. Data is from DNR, areas they have mapped.

GM -But - has that been incorporated previously? Or Is it a new category being included?

AH - Wouldn't call it new.

GM - OK - I really, really believe that debris flows is probably the biggest geological hazard we have in this county, and it's not being taken into consideration, so I'm wondering if anyone is updating what's considered.

AH - I don't think that's accurate. It is in there. There are maps of landslides from DNR and others.

AR - Landslides lead to debris flows. They are a different thing, Associated, but I don't think they are being mapped. We've seen a bunch of them now that had not been identified.

Angie - Do the best with the information that you have, you know?

GM- Ok - was just curious. I did not see any discussion of liquefaction as a geologic hazard previously.

GT - Speaks about advancement in technology to identify areas like this, use of drones now, etc. to look at these areas.

AR (interrupting) - Angie or Pete? Is there anything else to add?

Angie - NO.

Pete - No.

Final comments or directions?

Next Meeting

8:26 - AH - So, Pete and I spoke before this meeting. I probably will not have everything finished by the July 26th meeting. I don't believe Pete has anything for you for at the next meeting.

Pete - That's correct.

AR - Next meeting: August 23 (2021) Any last comments?

GT Move to adjourn.

8:28 - AR - Meeting adjourns at "8:28-ish."