

**WHITMAN COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION
03/10/2021
Comp Plan Update Workshop
MINUTES**

MEMBERS:

Chad Whetzel – Chair	Dave Gibney – Member
Brian Davies – Member	Keith Paulson – Member
Erina Hammer – Member	Hailey Wexler - Member

STAFF:

Alan Thomson – Whitman County Planner
Grace Di Biase – Whitman County Assistant Planner
Mark Storey – Public Works Director/County Engineer
Brandon Johnson – Whitman County ZOOM Host
Ginny Rumiser – Clerk

BOCC:

Art Swannack – Chair – District 1
Tom Handy – Commissioner – District 2
Michael Largent – Commissioner – District 3

LDC Consultants:

Todd Hall
Matt Covert
Sami Adams

Attendees:

Ken Duft; Brad Johnson; Shelley Chambers-Fox; Madysen McLain; Anthony Kuipers; Kim Weerts; Matt Webb; Uta Hutnak; Kylie Fullmer; James Lincoln; Palouse Conservation District

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Chad Whetzel – Thanks Alan. Next, we'll move onto unfinished business, and we'll continue on with the update to the Whitman County Comprehensive Plan. So, we'll turn it over to the consultants.

Alan Thomson – That is your cue Todd.

Todd Hall – Okay, let me get my video up and running. Good evening everyone, it's good to see you all. I know at the last meeting at the beginning of the year, I've not met

some of the Commissioners', so both Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners' held a joint meeting at the beginning of the year and this is our first formal virtual public meeting to kick off the Comprehensive Plan. And I have a short presentation to show you, so I'll get that up on the screen here if I can. Can everyone see all that?

Alan Thomson – I can see it.

Todd Hall – Okay great. Okay, so again, Commissioners and members of the public, good evening. My name is Todd Hall, I'm the Planning Manager with LDC. If you don't recall, we are the consulting firm that is helping Alan and Mark and the staff of Whitman County with the 2021 update to the Comprehensive Plan. With me tonight is also, Matt Covert, his is one of our planners at LDC and then also Sami Adams, who is an Associate Planner with LDC. She is in the background taking notes for us this evening.

So, both Matt and myself will tag-team on the presentation tonight. And, of course, you all know Alan Thomson and Mark Storey with the County. So, this is basic ZOOM instructions if everyone can mute themselves during the presentation, since we just observed that there are some times that there is echoing going on, so that would be greatly appreciated.

Then if there are moments during the presentation that somebody has a question, if Alan or anyone wants to stop me, just let me know. It's kind of hard sometimes for me to catch the raise of the hands. There is a raised hand function and whatnot and then I'll also chime in for you Alan, to kind of add some additional information on a couple of these slides.

So, just to start, "Why are we Here?" The current Whitman County Comprehensive Plan dates back, believe it or not, from 1978. It was done prior to that, back, I believe in 1960, but the most major update at that time was in 1978. And it hasn't seen a full update since that time.

So, it's been about 42+ years now that the Comp Plan hasn't gone through a full update. It's gone through some minor amendments since that time, but it is definitely well overdue for a comprehensive look. Based on the changes of public attitudes and the age and experiences, as well as changes in demographics over time and the economy and resource use.

It's known that Whitman County is certainly one that there are generations of families that have lived there for a very long time, but as in any case, of any county or jurisdiction, there's certainly changes that need to be documented and assessed and that will go a long way in terms of trying to offer the right services and support for the citizens as they move forward with the next 20 years.

So again, the Comp Plan will give the County an opportunity to take inventory of what has changed and what remains relevant and then identify current and emerging issues

that require attention. And then lastly, identify new goals and priorities based on the community feedback.

So, “Why do we plan?” Basically, it enhances public decision making. It coordinates community investments. It mitigates negative impacts of development and activity and it improves community outcomes, policies and regulations that support the community vision and goals and will likely be supported by the public and be successful.

There is a pretty significant amount of information that is obtained for the Comprehensive Plan and we’ll kind of get into those elements. Matt will touch base, later on in the presentation, to talk about all the different aspects of what goes into a comprehensive plan and how this relates to land use and development, to transportation, to economic development and so forth.

And so it is definitely a large undertaking for any jurisdiction, but certainly for a smaller community, like Whitman County, it’s a big project to review and go over and for also to make sure that we’re capturing each and every local concern and needs. Because over across the county, you may have more broad issues, but depending where exactly you are in the County, you’re going to have some specific needs or changes. So, if you’re near, say Colfax or Pullman, you might have certain concerns and issues to deal with regarding growth, versus others that may have some natural resources or environmental areas or the agricultural issues.

So, “What is Comprehensive Planning?” This in a nutshell is really the guiding document that captures the goals, objectives, policies and actions. And it also provides the community with an opportunity to express their vision of what they want to see for the future of Whitman County. This isn’t an exercise that is done in a vacuum behind closed doors. So, this is a collaborative effort that we want to make sure that we capture all of the community members, key stakeholders, elected officials, regional organizations and local jurisdictions.

So, on a subsequent slide, Matt will show kind of just a snippet of some of the partners. It’s not meant to be a catch all of everybody, but at least it gives you an idea of who we’re reaching out to and who we’re involving in the collaborative effort. And then lastly, the result is a guiding document for all the County’s planning efforts. And that’s across, like I said, with regards to land use, transportation, parks and recreation opportunities, and the management of all of those.

“Why does Whitman County need a Comprehensive Plan?” Well, the basis of everything in terms of comprehensive planning was adopted in 1990, the Planning Enabling Act, specifically RCW 36.70A, and that is really dealing with the management of land and resources. It’s important to note though, however, that Whitman County is not a fully planning county under the GMA. What that essentially means is that most of the more urbanized counties are required to fully plan and that captures about 11 different elements. But, Whitman County, because of its population and rural nature, you’re only required to plan regarding critical areas and natural resources.

Just to touch on what those mean is, critical areas really means environmental quality issues that can encompass wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, fish and wildlife conservation areas and climate change and things in that category. And then the other bucket is natural resources and agricultural conservation, which is your forestry, agriculture, fisheries and mining.

However, by choice, Whitman County is also planning for other elements, and that is, land use, transportation, economic development, public services, facilities and utilities, which also includes a renewable energy part and then parks, trails and recreation.

So, I mentioned this kind of vision to capture the vision of the community. It really is encompassing what the County citizens most value about the community. And like I said earlier, you may have a global vision for the entirety of the County itself, but you may have, depending on where you are at, have a kind of local needs and visions. So, what we try to do with a county comprehensive plan, such as this, we try to capture all of those in a number of ways and Matt will also go over that.

We have a survey out right now. We'll be having some public outreach, in-person events later this summer and then just really listening to everyone in the communities on kind of what really is the most important issues that you are facing and what you would like the County to address as they move forward in the next 20 years. Of course, those community members are working together to achieve this vision.

And then again, the goals and policies really are then based on this vision, the collective vision amongst the community. Goals and policies, are really, you know you have the high level goals, the 30,000 foot level, but then you also have these policy based statements that are getting more granular or more specific, depending on what the topic is.

So, the pyramid is really kind of to show how, within the State of Washington anyway, how the Growth Management Act and the Comp Plan and the development regulations work together. So, at the base level, like I said, is the Growth Management Act and that is really the main driver of land use planning within the State. And again, like I said, in Whitman County you're only doing a small snippet of it or are at least required to. But, the County, since it's been such a long time since a comprehensive look has been done on this, we're tackling a number of elements.

So, you've got that Growth Management Act that is kind of the foundation level and then the County has the Comprehensive Plan and then at the very top is the Whitman County Code. And that is your development regulations that is really what kind of implements a lot of the policies that you find in that Comprehensive Plan. And one thing that I didn't put on here that is important to note is, all the communities, at least those that are large enough, have their own comprehensive plans as well. So, that would be communities like Colfax and Pullman, for example. Those are based on their jurisdiction and size, but because they are also in the County, you want to make sure that those are collaborative and consistent with the overall Whitman County Comp Plan.

And then off to the side here that is really meant to just say that this whole process, no matter whether it's the Growth Management Act or the Code, everything involves the public. It's the public plan, the public's state, the public's county and you are all the key basis by how all this operates and functions. So the input is key into making this a successful project.

At this time I will turn it over to Matt and he'll kind of go over the next several slides and talk about some of the elements that are in our body of work that we are doing.

Matt Covert – Can everybody hear me? Great. So, thanks again for having us, everybody. As Todd mentioned, Whitman County is choosing to plan for a number of different elements or issues. This slide just shows the main topic areas or elements that the comp plan is going to focus on. Land use, environmental quality and natural resources, those are the two that Todd mentioned that are prior to the map of the county. Economic development, parks, trails, and recreation. Public services, facilities and utilities and transportation.

The stars there on the top four, I'm just going to go over some, a brief introduction to those four issues from the perspective of comprehensive planning and discuss a little bit how those issues may come up specifically for Whitman County and how those discussions may proceed.

The first one, Land Use, is often the most challenging but also the most central to comprehensive planning. It is kind of the basis for why we do this work. It's aiming to shape and guide the activities that humans do on the land. It is over long spans here, looking at how land is used now? How is that changed over the past 20 or in this case 40 something years, and how might it change over the next 20 years?

So, you are looking at existing population, existing land use, on a number of different categories. So agricultural land, different forms of residential areas, industrial land, and commercial areas like the Port then you look at future development and future issues that may come up with respect for land use but will merit a lot of interesting conversation for WC as we work through this process.

That includes things like, how does residential areas work around Pullman? You know, like the future of cluster zoning around the Pullman area. It's use like the siting of renewable energy facilities or the siting of mineral extraction facilities. Those are the sort of things that have to do with economic development certainly but also have a lot to do with land use. So it is kind of a foundational issue.

Another big one would be the further development of the Pullman-Moscow Corridor. That's a topic that crosses over a number of different elements including transportation, economic development, land use and then this issue of commercial areas within the agricultural zones and how that gets handled to the developer regulation process.

So the comp plan land use is an opportunity to address those from the level of goals and policies. So, do we want to prioritize, what should the County focus on, what should the County treat the edge cases, so it is an opportunity to really think proactively about these issues.

So, the next slide is Environmental Quality and Natural Resources. So, these are the two GMA required planning issues for WC. This one is interesting because the County, a couple years ago, with the 2019 updated critical areas regulations and so part of the impetus for doing this is that we want to make sure that those regulations and the comp plan are consistent.

So, getting back and looking at the Shoreline Master Program update, and the new critical areas regulations and just making sure that we have a policy document that matches up what the County did to update its regulations using best available science, working with the DNR and Ecology and important to note that critical areas, which are a policy name for environmental issues includes like wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, fish and wildlife habitat, like streams and rivers, frequently flooded area, I know that is a big one in parts of the southeast WA.

I know there has been a number of pretty big floods over the years and I grew up in Spokane so I heard about all the flooding in Colfax when I was a kid, and of course, the floods in Walla Walla a couple years ago. So, that is one that crosses over from environmental quality to land use and what types of land use do we want to prioritize frequently from there and how do we want to mitigate that? So, those are two flip sides of that issue that land use and the environmental quality that are important topics for discussion.

Economic Development. This is one that is really interesting from WC because I found that activity creates jobs and supports the work that WC does. There is a lot of discussion we understand about the future of the Pullman-Moscow corridor and to what extent that is to be a major concern of the County. There is a lot of collaboration that goes on between the County and the Port and the economic development authority local chambers of commerce, working with Pullman, WSU.

There is just a lot of economic development potential in that area and so how do we wrap in the airport, how do we make sure the infrastructure is there to support that economic development? How do we develop policies that focus on making sure there is suitable land, that there is identification of key infrastructure, and coordination of infrastructure investments, economic development programs that could be done in coordination with some of these partners? So, this is a really important topic for WC in this upcoming planning period.

Then the Importance of Parks & Recreation. As I mentioned the parks and recreation and trails element is going to be one of the things that gets updated and refreshed because of this comp plan. That is really important because first of all, because of the health and social benefits and economic value of good parks and recreation

opportunities. Inventory of existing parks, opportunities for future facilities, but with the increasing interest in rails and trails and those trail corridors.

That sort of crosses over between parks and transportation and how do we take unused elements of the transportation system and maybe re-purpose them for parks and recreation if the community thinks that is appropriate. That is where the comp plan can really help coordinate and make sure there is policy support for doing that kind of interdisciplinary work to improve public health, to improve social environment, economic value and tax base. That is just a good example of the way that a lot of these issues come together.

As Todd mentioned, none of this happens in a comp plan without going through a really robust process of coming up with all the groups that might want to or need to have a say in how policies get developed for the future of the County. Which really is everybody but specifically how can we use existing groups, existing organizations, existing institutions to build the knowledge base required to do as look out in the future?

This is just a snapshot of who we are engaging on these issues, but you see it touches on every one of those elements that is in the plan. Natural resources, economic development, agriculture, transportation, parks, talking to cities and schools, and talking to social service agencies. It really lives up to the name “comprehensive.” This is just a snapshot of the list. Probably what we are going to, hopefully we will hear from you all tonight is if there is a group that you think is going to be absolutely crucial to talk to here, we want to hear from you.

Speaking of which, one of the first things that we did to start that process of engaging WC on establishing a vision for the future of the County is a survey. Since January 19th, the survey was put out on the County’s website and we have gotten over 280 responses of this, which is great. We’d love to have more but we really asked some starting with general and then some more specific questions about priorities and issues that whether there should be a focus, and if how important certain issues are and then just a little bit of demographic information as well.

Just kind of review a couple of things here. This won’t surprise you, but when we asked what the top priorities are in the next 20 years, preservation of agriculture, diversity of businesses and jobs and natural resources and critical areas are by far the top three go getters.

Interestingly, as I mentioned, one of the issues of land use is how do we diversify business and jobs included in the agricultural area while also preserving agriculture? So there is some healthy tension there that the comp plan process can help explore and highlight, where we can introduce these diverse business opportunities and also preserving agriculture.

Just a couple other results. So we asked how long people have lived in WC. While over half of them have lived in the County for over 20 years, there is a substantial chunk of

the respondents who are in this in the 20-year category. You can see in that break down there and that is good. It is good to see a healthy diversity of views from folks who have been here a long time and folks who maybe haven't been here so long.

We also asked, this is just one example of questions, but is preservation of natural resources important to the future of the County? Not surprisingly, 80% said, "yes," but that is the kind of question that can help us identify the key elements of that vision is for the future of the County.

Now, I think Todd and possibly Alan are going to let us do some group questions to get at this issue, so I will turn it over to them.

Todd Hall – Yes, so I'll just go through the process here and Alan and Mark if you have any input here too, please do. Alan, I'll turn it over to you really briefly on the last one just to clarify the cluster zoning and I've included a slide on that. We wanted to have an opportunity for the participants to discuss a number of things this evening. I'll just go through this really quick.

- *In what ways has WC changed over the past 40 years?*
- *Is there a balance between agricultural, commercial and residential interests? If not, what do you think would restore it?*
- *Where should commercial development be allowed in Whitman County?*
- *How can we allow business flexibility in agricultural zones?* Lastly, and I will have Alan clarify this one a little bit more.
- *What are your thoughts on cluster zoning? Should we keep it where it is, get rid of it, or expand it?*

I'll put the cluster development slide up here and I will turn it over to Alan to expand more on that.

Alan Thomson – So, this is a snapshot of what exists right now. I'll give you an explanation of the lines there. So, the blue line in the interior part is the city limits of Pullman. Then the pink and the blue are zones within the County. So the pink is the Corridor District, in between Moscow and Pullman and blue is light industrial. We have a little bit of red over on the left there which is heavy commercial on the west side of town and a little bit from just below the light industrial districts. The yellow is the cluster residential opportunity zone.

So, back in 2004 we came up with the cluster residential concept around Pullman. It was a much bigger area than you see the yellow right now. That white line is our tax sharing area between Pullman and the County. So that white line is the boundaries of all within there.

We have this agreement with the City of Pullman that any new commercial businesses that come in to the unincorporated areas of WC we will be sharing that tax revenue with

Pullman, in case they do annex some of that land in the future, so we can preserve at least some of the tax income over a period of time after it has been annexed.

You can see on the northern end of Pullman there is an orange color. Those are the cluster areas that already exist and so they came in before that white line came in. So, after we made the agreement with Pullman for the tax sharing area, no more clustering was going to be allowed within that white area, that white line.

So, that is why you see the yellow outside of the white line. That is the remainder of the existing cluster opportunity zones. You can see in the northeast corner, the southeast corner and basically the south. Those are all the eligible areas that are left for the cluster. A big question for this update to the public is, should we continue with cluster residential zoning and where should we do that? It can't be inside the white line, obviously, it is going to be outside the white line and so that is a major conversation point. We'd like to get some feedback from that. What do you think of cluster residential and should we continue with it?

The areas that we have available right now in the yellow we've had no activity on them for quite some time, for a few years. So, no one seems to be biting on those areas, but could we think of some other areas that are outside that white line but close to Pullman?

That was one of the principle reasons for the public wanting to do cluster residential in the first place. They didn't want to be inside Pullman. They wanted to be close to Pullman and they wanted to be more than just a postage stamp of a parcel. So, that was what we heard from the public back in 2004 and 2005.

That is what we created and it was successful to a great degree. There was a lot of cluster areas just outside of Pullman. The original plan was within half a mile of city limits. Each quarter section that touched that ½ mile distance from the city limits was brought in. We brought in quarter sections that were within half a mile of the city.

A big question for the public is, do we want to continue this and if so, where would you like to do that? Back over to you, Todd.

Todd Hall – So, since we just finished with that question it might make sense to start there and work at the bottom question first. I guess we will open it up to the public. If you have anybody that would like to express their thoughts on cluster zoning as Alan described it and keep it where it is or expand it. So, I will just open it up to the group.

Hailey Wexler – I'd like to talk about the cluster zoning, if that is okay. I haven't really had a chance to express my thoughts on it. As I mentioned before, my family has some land, about 600 acres north of Pullman really close to that cluster zoning.

In talking to my family about the pros and cons of cluster zoning and just as far as like it is great to have the opportunity as a farmer to sell a little bit of your land to help pay for everything else that you are doing because farming is expensive. If you can make that

little bit of money selling off a good chunk, and also people getting to live out there and enjoy having a little chunk of land out there, I think something that is maybe a concern with the clusters too.

I don't know if you have already talked about it before is how big of a chunk of land each individual gets and if that could be brought down. Because sometimes the land seems like if you have a big chunk and you aren't doing anything with it some people are putting horses out there and some people are just letting it sit and go to weeds.

If it is going to weeds right next to farmland you have that coming together and causing problems for the farmers. So, I just wanted to bring that up and the pros and cons there in my, but I definitely do like the idea of farmers being able to sell off little chunks to help those who do want to live out there.

Alan Thomson – Hailey, I can address some of your comments there. So, the original concept requires 20 acres and that is on the books right now. That exists at this moment in time. A minimum of 20 acres and that would be split into four parcels, four buildable lots. We left it up to the landowner, these were farmers at the time who owned the land so there is only one entity that owned this 20 acres and then they would short plat it into four parts.

The code gave them a range of the size the parcels could be from as low as half an acre all the way up to 4-5-6 acres. That choice was given to the landowner at that time. So, that one entity, that landowner, created the size of the parcels at the time. So if your family, just hypothetically you were doing this, you would decide on the size of the parcels. So, typically what happens was we got four 5-acre parcels. That is normally what would happen.

We were hoping that people would do half-acre lots and that would mean they would be concentrated in one little area and the remainder would be open space and you could still farm that open space. That never happened. So, that is the development regulations. So, we could throughout this process if need be, if there is enough interest in it we could change the development regulations to make the parcels ultimately smaller. But that is how things worked in the first place, so it was up to the owner of that land initially to decide how big the parcels would be.

Hailey Wexler – Okay, I appreciate you clearing that up. That makes a lot of sense.

Art Swannack – I'd like to add on to Alan's comment. There is a second issue there, to be aware of and that is the Department of Ecology's regulations with regards to water use. They basically told us that you could have four people running off of one well on that 20 acres, but you couldn't have developments that had nine or ten or a bunch more people in well sites in that 20 acres. So, there is a limit under the way they want water for exempt well use drawn. Mark or Alan probably have more details than I do on that one. It got into an issue that you couldn't make a bunch of little spots out there each with its' own individual well.

Hailey Wexler – That makes sense too.

Alan Thomson – Art, I can add on to that one. Things changed since we first started clustering in 2004 with the DOE to today. The original concept was you could have, the original person that created this would have to drill one well. They would have a sharing agreement for all of the lots. So, that one well would be CC&R's, Covenants, Codes, and Restrictions. That is part of the law and one well would be allowed to be shared with all four of the future parcels.

When another individual came in and bought one of the lots, they could drill their own well, but we're talking about one well for four parcels being exempt for regulations, exempt well water regulations. So, 5,000 gallons a day for all four of them, not 5,000 each. Not 20,000 gallons. Four into 5,000, 1,250 gallons each, that is how we started things. That was the concept originally.

Things morphed and changed the last 4-5 years. Ecology has clamped down on things so now we are dealing with a public water system for four parcels that is shared by one well. We came to an agreement with the local environmental health office who regulates the water here for Ecology.

The first two parcels at the moment on a cluster of four can have just an exempt well and have two hook-ups. As soon as the third one comes in, we are into a Group B public water system. So, all four of them together on one well would be a public water system and that is what we've got today. Essentially, it is a public water system for any clusters that have been done in the last 2-3 years. Everybody needs to be aware of that because an exempt well is a lot different from a public water system.

When you are dealing with a public water system you are dealing with the State Department of Health, not the local environment health office. It is a little bit more involved time wise and maybe a little bit more expensive to put in water for four built out lots. Now it is a public water system. So, you could have four wells but Ecology is going to consider that project one project and each would be limited to the 1,250 gallons a day and it would be a public water system.

Tom Handy – I've got a question about the cluster development. You said that there can't be any more inside the white line and I was curious why that is. Especially since the white line wasn't there when they went in.

Alan Thomson – You can ask your friends in the City of Pullman about that one. That was one of the requirements. Pullman required us not to have, that was part of the deal. They didn't want any more clustering within the tax sharing area.

Dave Gibney – I'd like to address some of the comments that have been made. I will start with Tom. The City would really rather not have the clusters next to it, because over time they cause complications and evenly extending the city services when that area, if it does become annexed. So it was, I'm not sure I fully agree with it, but that's

the rationale and that was the strong sticking point that the City was not going to do the tax sharing area unless the County agreed that clusters would not happen, there would be no more clustering in that tax sharing area.

The purpose of the tax sharing area is to raise funds to facilitate extending services out into the corridor. The other, the City really doesn't want a lot of those clusters happening in areas that are within the urban growth boundary that the City has established which is give or take that white line. Also, the other point that Hailey was making that selling some land owned by the agricultural community for residents can be an economic positive thing for those ag landowners. It seemed to me that may be something that they want to do and in areas that aren't necessarily right up against Pullman.

We have over the years made it relatively difficult to transfer land from ag use to residential use. Whether or not the clusters continue it seems to me that during this planning process we should be addressing the balance of those regulations about putting housing in some areas all around the County. The economic, the way that the County is going to get any real additional revenue is to continue to have economic development and retail in the unincorporated parts of the County.

If we can get some more people living in places like Steptoe and Malden and Pine City and some unincorporated areas, the possibilities out there could be a winning thing for both everybody. Another thing on the clusters is when you look at it a big chunk of that white area especially to the north there, surrounding those orange bits that was in a cluster opportunity zone prior to the tax sharing area.

That part out towards the end of the airport rapidly took advantage of the grandfathering when the tax area came in. But there was a lot of area available for cluster. It just never happened. Even some of that that is orange, I think, is already plotted for cluster. Doesn't necessarily have houses constructed on all the parcels. The cluster thing may in some ways may be an idea that there just really doesn't take a lot of attraction. Thank you for letting me talk a bit.

Chad Whetzel – Dave and Alan, correct me if I am wrong on the tax sharing system and you guys have touched on that but I don't know if that is clear to everyone. That tax sharing agreement is outside of the city limits and the idea is that if something is built in the County, say something similar to the Hinrichs or light industrial type business, if the City then incorporates the area, the County will continue to receive money for that for a set period of time. Is that correct?

Dave Gibney – That is part of the, right now if the, if retail happens in that area and sales tax occurs in that area, there is a percentage of what comes to the County and a percentage of what comes to Pullman that is put into funds that are available to extend city services out to the corridor. Then if the area gets annexed there is a drawdown of the property tax such as the County keeps it, a piece of it I believe for a 10-year period

and I think that any of that sales retail, the City and the County continue to split it for a period even after annexation. I think there are few other details.

Alan Thomson – That is the main gist of it. It protects the County, if we develop, like St. John Hardware for instance, that new building that just went out in the corridor that would come under the tax sharing agreement.

Dave Gibney – No it doesn't because it is part of the Hawkins land area and the County excluded the Hawkins area from the tax sharing area.

Art Swannack – Actually, that is incorrect Dave. We excluded the Hawkins area, as long as the County had a financial obligation towards the Hawkins development. Once that went, which was the sale of the property, the agreement basically became null and void. Then it became part of the tax sharing area.

Dave Gibney –I wasn't aware of that.

Art Swannack – There was a clause in there specifically that if that failed, if it went forward we knew we had a big obligation to it. We couldn't afford to be sharing the revenue but with it dead we didn't have a problem with sharing the revenue. Just so you guys know, if something happens in the unincorporated areas on sales tax, the County gets the 1%. If it happens inside of the City and the County we get 15% of 1% normally. With the tax sharing agreement, we split that 50%-50% on the 1%. There's a whole bunch other terms in there but that is the gist of it.

Dave Gibney –It only took the County and the City somewhere between 10-15 years to come to the agreement.

Art Swannack – It was the first thing that Largent assigned me to do when I got elected.

Dave Gibney – And they started it when Helen Stiller was on the council.

Chad Whetzel – Okay, I just wanted to make sure everybody understood the way that tax sharing agreement worked.

Erina Hammer – I have a quick question. The opportunity zone that opened that nobody took, why was it undesirable? I'm not as familiar with that part of the County.

Alan Thomson – Erina, it is all about the market. People were not interested in certain areas like in the south part that is still outside of the tax sharing area. We've had no bites there at all. It's all about the landowner wanting to give up some land, wanting to sell land and then also the public somebody wanted to buy that land. I think the market dictates that pretty much.

Erina Hammer – So, is that as you are going out of Pullman towards Colton? I'm terrible with maps. Is that where that is?

Alan Thomson – Yes, you can see these blue areas here that is where Jess Ford is, and so it is yes, you are right, heading south out of Pullman. All that land is basically behind the developed areas, behind Jess Ford. That is where this is but access to that is a bit of an issue.

Erina Hammer – Okay, that makes sense.

Alan Thomson – The areas that were popular, Kitzmiller Road, big time. That's where it all first started. Then Sunshine Road, down here. That was a big starting point there too and then it tended to go across the Airport Road.

Erina Hammer – There was good access.

Alan Thomson – Yes that is the key.

Dave Gibney – The part on Airport Road came through the grant was rapidly clustered when the tax sharing area would be grandfathered away.

Tom Handy – Okay, one more quick question. I don't want to belabor this but in that white zone in the opportunity zone where it was shut off for cluster development, in that zone currently there probably is not going to be a lot of retail or sales tax generated in that area anyway just because of where it is, but there could be residential. So what I'm asking is yes, we might share the sales tax revenue but how does the property tax revenue get treated in that area?

Alan Thomson – The main thrust of this agreement, Tom, is commercial operations. Not residential. We are not counting houses in that tax sharing agreement. It is retail and commercial.

Dave Gibney – I think any property tax in the area is under that 10-year.

Art Swannack – It gets complicated. Property tax is a little of an interesting animal because like our general fund property tax of the County is paid by the resident whether or not they live inside the city or out in the unincorporated county part. The road tax isn't paid by the residential area and that was part of putting money aside for development in the corridor was making sure we have money being built up to develop that infrastructure. Tom, is there a specific question on that that you are trying to understand? It is probably easier to give you the tax sharing agreement to read and then give yourself a headache.

Tom Handy – I guess my point in trying to discover this in my mind is that if what we decided to do 20 years ago hasn't happened and hasn't worked, is it time to maybe, since we are going through a comp plan, maybe revisit a bunch of these things and at least get some activity, some sort of economic development going in those areas that seem to be quite stagnate and then rethink some of the other texts. That is kind of where I was heading. I was just trying to make sense of it.

Art Swannack – As Dave said the white line around that whole thing is pretty much Pullman’s growth area where their plan is. I think it is a 50-year growth line isn’t it Dave?

Dave Gibney – Yes, give or take.

Tom Handy – So, that would take talks with Pullman to make any changes with that.

Dave Gibney – Because we are not a growth management act county, the City of Pullman’s urban growth management area is advisory and not an obligation to the County to pay any attention legally. But we will appreciate it if they do.

Mark Storey – I’ve been listening to all this and maybe I can chime in. Having actually written the tax sharing agreement with Mark Workman, the white line is quite a ways out from the urban growth line of Pullman. The white line is really a negotiated line between Pullman and the County in where the City would like protection against cluster development housing and that was really what that white line represented. It is actually quite a ways out from the urban growth boundary though. Even the 50-year boundary.

Dave Gibney – It is not that far out on the west and you are correct it does go further out the corridor than our urban boundary, and it is not a lot further south but it is not a lot further north.

Mark Storey – But a very small amount of white line expansion is a huge area of development. Anyway, I’ll stop.

Dave Gibney – What Tom was saying, I think there may well be opportunity for economic and retail at the intersections of the state highways and at Wawawai Road.

Art Swannack – One of the things the code does not have at the current time is a development residential like you have with the city code. Our comp plan doesn’t have that in it, as I understand it. Alan can chime in or Mark. But that is one of the potential issues that they do a development out at the former Hawkins site was, what do we do in our code to enable such a development to happen? We really don’t have a multi-family in our code and the comp plan would have to say it is okay too.

Dave Gibney – That would be what Hailey mentioned is that potentially extending that ability to fund other farm, another ag by selling some bits for residential.

Alan Thomson – I think the point that Art is getting into with the former Hawkins land which is now owned by the Druffels is they have a water right. There is a water right and that is the big difference. So, if you are going to develop housing anywhere else in the County you are contained to exempt wells.

So, that means we can’t do large lot subdivisions or large lot residential subdivisions. We can’t have clusters that big because you are contained to one well for any houses that you build. But it is entirely different with the Druffels’ land because they do have a

substantial water right. So what Art was getting to is that there is a potential to have a mixed use development on that land. The code does not accommodate for that. The development regulations do not accommodate for that right now.

So, that is a point of discussion that will go through the comp plan and then if we all think that would be a potentially good thing to do, we need to write something into that comp plan and then we would need to change the developer regulations.

Dave Gibney – There is a whole lot of public on this meeting that we ought to get a chance to listen to.

Chad Whetzel – So far no one has put anything up to speak, so if they want to go ahead and use your hand or go ahead and type and do the chat and make sure everyone can see it. We will be happy to talk you.

Todd Hall – We talked about the cluster one for a while we are certainly open to some of the other questions that are up on the screen so, if you want to work our way backwards since we went on the bottom, how could we allow business flexibility in agricultural zones? This kind of gets at some of the points that were brought up in the cluster zoning as well. So, we will open it up for discussion. How can we allow business flexibility in ag zones?

Hailey Wexler – We were talking about business flexibility. What exactly is that talking about? What sort of businesses in ag zones are we talking about?

Todd Hall – Alan, do you want to elaborate on that?

Alan Thomson – So, just business diversity. Right now, with the way that the agricultural district code is written, there is a certain list of permitted uses and conditional uses listed in there. Keep in mind that this was written 45 years ago, so it was all agricultural activities. Basically they were all to do with ag. So, there is a list of things that you can do in the agricultural district but it is limited.

One of the things to think about here is things like commercial zones or light industrial zones, so those type of businesses that we would like to maybe diversify into. Not just ag related things. But diversifying the economy. That takes a couple of different things to happen. The landowner has to be amendable to selling some land. That is a biggie right there, and then the market. We have to have two things come together in order to put a business in WC. Someone is willing to sell land and someone is willing to build a business. That is always a question. There are opportunities right now and nobody is rushing out to knock down the doors on that one.

Chad Whetzel – I assumed also that along with the commercial development it sounds like with the well issues. Do we have any issues there or how does that work?

Alan Thomson – What kind of issues?

Chad Whetzel – Water issues.

Alan Thomson – Water issues, well, water is always an issue. It is always going to be there. Think about places like Spokane County. Why is the development going on outside of the City around Spokane? Because they have private water systems. Then they can develop commercial and residential. We don't have that. We are contained to exempt wells, so if a businesses wants to start in the unincorporated area they drill a well and that's an exempt well that allows withdrawals up to 5,000 gallons a day. That's it. You can't have big subdivisions on an exempt well.

Chad Whetzel – Right. I guess I was thinking more of a commercial development. Is that going to be an issue where they need to be located adjacent to municipalities that are willing to extend water to them or where are we looking at right now?

Alan Thomson – I'm not aware of Pullman wanting to extend water outside their boundaries. That is probably never going to happen or not going to happen, so far anyway. That typically is the way it is. We have to be contained to an exempt well and typically businesses want to be close to the urbanized area. So, it would be not far out of Pullman, not far out of Colfax, or any other town. They need to be close. Then the road system is another big part of it. You have to have all year round access roads. Not on dirt roads or gravel roads that wouldn't work too well for commercial businesses.

Chad Whetzel – I was thinking more along the lines of some sort of a manufacturing plant going in there, Lacrosse, if I remember correctly. Is there a way we can help small towns or could we try to contain more of these things to incorporated areas?

Alan Thomson – Well, Lacrosse is incorporated so that answers that question. You know, maybe having more opportunities for housing around places like Garfield, Lacrosse, Colfax and what not. We did reach out to those communities when we put the cluster residential zone in place but we thought around Pullman was one place. What about the other incorporated towns? We never got any feedback on that from any of those towns. It never happened elsewhere. That is something we may want to think about to get some feedback from some of the incorporated towns and in the community and on the Palouse.

Dave Gibney – Can I reverse the question and say, what are the aspects of our code and our plan that reduce the flexibility for business in the agricultural zone and there are still things that we want to be doing?

Alan Thomson – I can think of a few things having worked with that code for 18 years. It is pretty restrictive. For instance, there is one thing that I would offer the commissioners here tonight, a change that I would be advocating. It is for mini-storage. Mini storage seems to be pretty popular and it is not an allowed use in the ag district code. We have to change the zone and we all know how difficult that is to do.

So, that is one thing that I think would be a good idea to add into the ag district. There are probably a bunch of others that we could make it easier to have businesses instead

of having to go through a contentious zone change or a contentious conditional use. There are some thoughts there.

Tom Handy – I think there are a lot of things that aren't really coming to mind when people think about business. They think about buildings and manufacturing and maybe a convenience store and that but think about something like a sports venue, what Matt Webb did out in the County there. That's a legitimate business as I understand it. It wasn't allowed in the County. So he had to have it annexed in the city. Maybe I'm wrong about that but that is how I understand that. Some of those types of things we need to really think about a lot of different opportunities that could be placed out in those ag zones that probably wouldn't disrupt ag either.

Alan Thomson – I agree and that is part of the whole process here. We've got to think about those things and bring them up, talk about it and see if we can make it work.

Chad Whetzel – Brian, did you have something you wanted to say. You're muted.

Brian Davies – Here I am. Thinking outside of the box, as Tom said, what about, I know we've permitted and we've done some zone changes for RV parks outside of Pullman, not too far outside of Pullman. I think that is going to be another one that is going to pop up from time to time.

We just permitted one or we didn't have to permit one because we have that language in entry-commercial in Uniontown that allowed for an RV park to go in on some property that had been basically vacant for years and years and years. So, we are going to try that out within our city limits.

Alan Thomson – We allowed for RV parks and similar types of activities in the County but they all have to go through a conditional use and I wouldn't recommend taking that away. We definitely have potential impacts that we need to be evaluating. So, even though we don't have the words "RV Park" written in the code we have something similar in there that allows that kind of activity to happen. So, the opportunity is there and I agree with Brian, I think that is something that we need to have a little more of, but again, landowner, we need a landowner to step up.

Todd Hall – Does anyone have anything else to chime in on this question? We've been moving on up to work it out for development to be allowed. We've answered a couple of those now and we could certainly touch on the second one there from the top.

Is there a balance between agricultural, commercial and residential interests? If not, what do you think can restore it?

Art Swannack – The issues that are going on about quarries and whether they are compatible with some of the other stuff around them. Do you think there is a need in the code to have a bigger spacing or separation from operations that are doing heavy

work like blasting, grinding, making big rocks into small rocks, from other uses that what we current have?

Alan Thomson – I think that needs to be addressed. We know it is difficult. These are natural resources that we need to protect. We need these and it becomes pretty difficult to push one of these through with a conditional use. I think that my recommendation would be that we encompass all of the natural resource areas that we have on the ground right now. Identify them in the comp plan and say that they are protected.

That is the GMA thing. We want to protect those areas because they are necessary. New quarries are a difficulty. We can't identify them ahead of time. If we could we could protect that area but we have to have a landowner and a business come to us just like Western Construction, for instance, out on Palouse-Albion road. Then they go from there, go through a conditional use process.

Todd Hall – This is a question for Alan. Is there any of those quarries or other businesses that are threatened in some way by any kind of future development or anticipated development? I think I get what you are saying is providing a buffer around them or protection so those are kept in perpetuity because of the importance of the value to the County.

Alan Thomson – That is one of the main things that we need to tackle with this update. We need to identify those areas, and there is language in the GMA that says those areas need to be protected. I think that is one of my bullet points I would like to have put in here. It is not that we can't have housing nearby. It is just that you have to accept it as a natural resource area here if you want to live close by. That kind of understanding.

Tom Handy – I think the market kind of drives some of that. I'm saying that from previous experience. I bought my house right next to Poe Asphalt on the Pullman-Moscow Highway when Poe Asphalt was actively mining and crushing there. We did wake up in the morning to dynamite blasts and things like that but we knew it. It was fully obvious when we bought the house. But now they are gone.

So, now my property value has gone way up, you know. It's in a good spot. I've got a neighbor that is really nice and quiet because that whole area was re-purposed to park RV's there. So, I think if we wind up getting so restrictive that we don't allow things to happen, then a little bit more natural in our data fashion, we are going to make it too complicated for growth to happen. So I just wanted to throw that out.

Art Swannack – One of the issues that we have with the County is finding and getting new quarries in order to maintain the road system we have. That is a different aspect from the commercial quarry for other development purposes but they still have the same characters at least part of the year.

Chad Whetzel – It sounds like even though we don't have the, we don't know where the quarries are going to go immediately. New quarries we have to be able to protect, to

continue to develop quarries, because once you mined out raw that quarry is closed and you can't get anything else out of there, you have to move on.

Alan Thomson – My hope is that we can have some language in the new comp plan that helps the public understand that this is a necessary resource. The arguments we are getting from people nearby quarries is that we are taking away their property values and destroying their peace and quiet. It is kind of a “nimby,” type of attitude. Then they can look at the comp plan, the existing comp plan right now and come up with arguments saying that this is not protecting public health, welfare and safety.

That is one of my big concerns about the existing comp plan. People can argue that this is against their interests and public interests. My hope is that we can clarify some of that in the new different edition of this. To help people understand that if you build your house out in the County it doesn't mean that there can't be anything else around you or near you. There are other things that need to be allowed to be happening nearby where you build your house. That is not clear in the comp plan that we have right now.

Todd Hall – The good news is that you have some neighboring counties that have recently adopted a much more recent anyway, adopted a comp plan that has some language that could be some inspiration to protect those. I am certain your neighbors have some of the same issues and concerns. Maybe not all at the same level size as Pullman or Colfax, but in the same vein wanting to protect or need to protect those natural resources.

Tom Handy – I've got a question for Mark. What is the average life of a quarry that the County needs to use?

Mark Storey – I'm not sure there is good answer. We did open one down near Colton 15 years ago and we are closing it now. So that one was 10 years and then we also have some quarries that are 80 plus years old and still running. It just depends on the rock resource, available land and it depends a lot on the engineering design. Because DNR requires us to file all kinds of closure and reclamation permits and plans before we even crush our first ton of rock.

If you were to pick an average it would probably be between 20 and 30 years. I don't know if I answered our question but that is the best I can do without a site specific plan. That's what Alan is referring to. It gets really challenging to say what you can get out of a quarry because they are also sight specific.

Chad Whetzel – One of the things, I guess in the old plan agriculture was very well protected and sounds like we need to think about how we are going to protect some of these other natural resources.

Alan Thomson – The two natural resources we are really talking about are agriculture and quarrying rock. We haven't done forestry yet just because.

Chad Whetzel – Elberton used to be a logging town.

Keith Paulson – Is there any setbacks for quarries? Do houses have to be back so far?

Alan Thomson – There are setbacks to property lines. Then notification to people next to quarries, 1,000 foot notification. So, that is the only way I can answer that. There are setbacks to property lines.

Keith Paulson – I was just curious. We have 1,500 feet from houses for vies and stuff. Could there be something like that for a quarry? So maybe we don't have that issue of noise and dust and stuff because the houses are set back.

Alan Thomson – The county code has 1,000 foot setback to any resident. If there is a residence within 1,000 feet of a quarry that is not owned by the landowner, we have to get a waiver from them. If you can't get a waiver then you have to be beyond 1,000 feet.

Chad Whetzel – Does that cause any heartache in opening new quarries?

Alan Thomson – Yes, there is always a heartache in opening a new quarry. You know, it is a reasonable setback. But some people don't agree that it is reasonable. So, if you are beyond 1,000 feet where we can go ahead with the application. But inside 1,000 feet if someone doesn't want it that close to their house, then it doesn't happen.

I know we have some farmers out there that are watching right now and they are being very silent. There are a number of people here, one in particular I'm looking at right now who may have some input on some of agricultural use conflicts with housing, conflicts with business, other businesses. That is the conversation point we are trying to get to. Don't be shy.

Michael Largent – You will have to be specific as to which farmers you are looking at, Alan.

Alan Thomson – You're one. Don't you have something to share with us?

Michael Largent – I'm not a member of the public. Here's Kim. I will say it out loud.

Kim Weerts – I was just going to say this is a first meeting for me and this is a learning session. I'm just trying to soak up the information to try and figure out the questions that I and the cattlemen want to ask. I'm learning a lot.

Alan Thomson – Have you filled out the survey, Kim?

Kim Weerts – I have.

Alan Thomson – Okay, good.

Kim Weerts – I have a note to the cattlemen to fill out and I will send it out and I have a note to send it out again and tell them to pony up.

Alan Thomson – Thank you, Kim.

Kim Weerts – I did have one question. When you are looking at the update are you going to be looking at the Voluntary Stewardship Program and what they have been doing or ideas?

Alan Thomson – I think it is going to be a component here, yes. Because the Voluntary Stewardship Program is actually helping to preserve agricultural lands.

Kim Weerts – And addressing the critical areas.

Alan Thomson – Yes, addressing the critical areas.

Todd Hall – I think we have them listed on the natural resources critical area. It's right there in the middle column there.

Alan Thomson – Yes, it is written in there, Voluntary Stewardship Program.

Michael Largent – Alan, as a farmer I will just hop in here. As long as Kim doesn't slap me later. One of the questions posed on this slide is how has WC changed in the last 40 years. Well, I exceed that age range and I can remember picking up all of my school clothes and shopping done in Colfax. I had to ask directions for Pullman when I got my driver's license because both things were done in Colfax.

But if you remember the houses on hilltop issue, that was when I was a baby Commissioner and that applied across the entire county and one of my reservations with the houses on hilltop and view shed was the housing pressure wasn't as great in most of the County as it is around Pullman.

As we look at residential around the County, I think we should look at particular areas going back to the changes in forty years, towns like particularly Endicott, I'm thinking of and St. John. I think being less restrictive where there is less pressure might be appropriate. So the communities outside of those small town city limits have an opportunity to maybe get some more people and provide some economic vitality to smaller towns. I don't know if that made any sense, but,

Alan Thomson – Are you thinking of amending the view shed?

Michael Largent – No, no, no. That was the point that was raised at that time. I'm just raising a similar point now as we look at the comp plan that some areas for the time being perhaps allowing more houses and families to a site around those small incorporated towns would be appropriate. I'm a little hesitant about county wide restrictions on housing because housing is different across the County.

As time goes on and we see that maybe we should be a little more restrictive that might be more appropriate at a later point in time. It may be decades down the road, maybe not. I'm one that likes to see families move into communities. We have less of them than we had before.

Alan Thomson – One thought I have about, and this only aims at the development regulations, not so much the comp plan, although it is mentioned in the comp plan but the way we have our development regulations right now for building houses in the County is one house per legal lot. We used to have two before we did the changes in 2007.

Just as an observation of the last 2-4 years we've had a number of family farmers asking about building a second house on their property. Right now you can build an accessory dwelling which is restricted to 1,200 square feet and two bedrooms. But we've had a number of people wanting to build just another regular house on their property and the code won't allow that right now. That is a thought that with the BOCC if you are amendable to that we could change the zoning regulations to allow two houses on a parcel of land like we had before 2007.

Michael Largent – I would be amenable to that, discussing that concept with the caveat that the area surrounding Pullman might be different than the area surrounding Lacrosse.

Alan Thomson – Well, you've got one zone, the agricultural district. So, not that it is impossible to address that but we would have to address that specifically. If you were going to do something different around Lacrosse or Pullman there would have to be some fix with the zoning regulations in order to allow that.

Michael Largent – Okay I'll shut up.

Art Swannack – I don't think it is a bad thought. I was reading through the 547 pages of comments, I only made it part way through so you can feel better about that, Michael. But I would say there were several comments in there about people looking for places for their in-laws to be able to live near them so they could care for them out in some of those areas.

Dave Gibney – Our legislature does things like that all the time saying something like, in the areas near more than 500,000 population you can do this and otherwise you can't. You know, if you say, "Near areas greater than 30,000 population you can't do this and your area is less than 5,000 you can." Things like that.

Michael Largent – Thanks for defending me, Dave, after Alan made me feel bad.

Todd Hall – I think that since WC doesn't have to fully comply with the GMA and it only addresses those two areas, Agriculture and minerals, you have a little bit greater

flexibility. As Alan pointed out the water right restrictions. So, there are some creative ways to come up with some ideas that are kind of limited by a number of other factors. Not necessarily state driven but just others.

Michael Largent – Indeed true, but isn't the comp plan more of a general statement about our intent and mission? You could deal with the specifics of the actual siting in code later or compliance with state law, I'm just suggesting that our communities outside of Pullman are growing smaller. There are less houses on our farms. I could count probably 5-6 home sites where I am the only one remaining. We've seen a population decrease in the rural areas and that is not entirely positive for these rural communities.

Todd Hall – If I'm not mistaken on the joint meeting that we had at the beginning, that was one of the comments that we are losing population and that is probably driven by some of the economic development challenges that are happening there. Businesses closing or people just moving away and trying to keep that community alive is a concern and challenge.

Michael Largent – Farm efficiency has probably driven the population to decline more than anything. However, that doesn't mean that there aren't other things that might attract families to other areas. It could be productive and much needed and participants in these local communities.

Art Swannack – One of the interesting anomalies going on right now is Oakesdale. There are a lot of families that have moved to Oakesdale to work at Schweitzer or other areas because they have a relatively decent road to drive down there, but they can raise their family in a small town. There is one couple who live there they knew about it somehow and the road system is pretty important with that ability to get around successfully year around.

Michael Largent – Then why don't you fix Hume Road, Art?

Art Swannack – It's on the list, we have money coming.

Michael Largent – I'm tired of waiting for you.

Erina Hammer – I would second that. We would appreciate that. I'd also just add to that, some people not only work in Pullman but they work in Spokane as well, so it is really nice for families who work in multiple areas.

Todd Hall – Are there any other comments from the public or commissioners or Alan or Mark? Any additional thoughts or input? I just want to be respectful of everyone's time this evening. I really appreciate all the feedback that you have given so I will give it one more chance here and then we will wrap things up. Anybody have some additional thoughts?

Dave Gibney – That forty years is just about the time that I have actually lived down here. Pretty much I came back to stay after the summer in '81 but I think that Mike Largent said the efficiency of the farmers have gotten better and that's reduced some of the population. But I think the farmers from when I first came here to now, my observations are that they are also taking better care of their land than they appeared to have been, especially in terms of run off and things like that. I think that we need to do what we can to try to get a better working together between the rural and the urban, if there is something that we can do to reduce any perceived or actual divide, I think that would be a good thing.

Todd Hall – Alan did you have any questions or anything you wanted to get from the group?

Alan Thomson – I think it was a good discussion and just like Kim was saying they are just, she is just learning what is going on here and absorbing information. We are going to have more of these meetings and we may all be having some in-person meetings later on in the year, hopefully. So, I look forward to getting more feedback.

Let's get more feedback from the survey and anybody who has any questions you can get directly in touch with me at the Planning office or Mark Storey or the Commissioners. They would be happy to answer questions. But thanks for all the participation and we will continue on and hopefully get more people involved and get more comments back before we start putting words on paper.

Todd Hall – I'll just close it out, too. As Alan said, there are more opportunities here, so of course, due to Covid we have been limited to the virtual meetings but it is more likely we can re-connect in person as we are all used to. It is our anticipation to get there at some time in July. In the meantime there is project information on the County's website and online and, of course, the survey which we mentioned. Please spread the word.

We are just thrilled that there has been that many respondents so far, close to 300 and we'd love to have more. So, tell your family, friends, neighbors, please get involved. Then when we come out this summer, we'd love to meet everybody. That's the really true, genuine public outreach that we all enjoy as planners and like to engage with the public.

So this is just a snapshot of the project timeline. I know I've shown this before but this shows where we have been, where we are headed. We still are at the beginning stages of the project so the two stars show where these meetings are to date so far.

So, March 10th at the top there, and then currently our team is working on data collection review and existing conditions and doing a lot of updates on the maps that you saw on some of these slides. We've had some really archaic old photography that was pretty good in the 70's but we have our GIS and a lot of computer mapping and so you'll see a lot more color and really nice graphics in there that will hopefully last a long while. It will be useful for the community.

Then, of course, we will be doing some more of these outreach with the boards, commissions and public outreach over there in WC. As you heard, we are going to have to do a lot of comparison with the comp goals and policies as they come up and do a little bit of the zoning code on it. Those have to be consistent as I mentioned. If we do propose something such as a little changes of the residential code or allowing commercial in different areas, we will have to take a closer look at the code.

Then as we get closer to that late summer and into the fall we will be finalizing the draft plan, doing the SEPA, which is the environmental review and then lastly, just hearings and adoption of this in the fall.

So, here is the contact information if you want to jot that down. It is also on the website. Please visit the county's website for information on the plan and feel free to contact Alan or Mark. We are just thrilled that you are participating tonight. Thank you so much.

Art Swannack – Alan, there is one thing that needs to be talked about in the meeting sometime. That is the whole trail discussion because the code does need it. I'm saying don't do it tonight, but I do think you need to plan to have that discussion about all the ins and outs of that subject. I don't claim to know them all but the first 75 pages have lots of people who are advocating for trail stuff.

Alan Thomson – I think that is a good point and we need to thrash that one out. I agree. Todd, Matt and Sami thank you very much.

Matt Covert – Thank you for having us.

Alan Thomson – Thank you for the good presentation. Thank you all the public that participated.

Brian Davies –Welcome to Hailey.

Hailey Wexler – Thanks everybody.

Alan Thomson –Good seeing you all and see you next time. Good night.

Chad Whetzel – We forgot to discuss the next meeting and we didn't adjourn and we didn't do new business.

Alan Thomson – There was no new business. It was a continuation of old business.

Mark Storey – I'm glad we are recording this.

Michael Largent - Let the record say what I said, Mark.

Mark Storey – It will.

Art Swannack – I did say to adjourn. I don't know if it got picked up earlier.

Michael Largent – But you're not the planning commission chair.

Chad Whetzel – Yes, this is our meeting. Why are you still here?

Adjourned – 8:53 p.m.