

**WHITMAN COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION
ZOOM WORKSHOP
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
September 15, 2021**

MEMBERS:

Chad Whetzel, Chairman
Brian Davies
Keith Paulson

Dave Gibney
Weston Kane
Matt Hammer

Staff: Alan Thomson, WC Planner; Grace Di Biase, WC Assistant Planner; Brandon Johnson, Public Works; Elinor Huber, Clerk.

Others: Shelly Fox Chambers; Lisa Carloye; Karen Hinnenkamp; Barney Buckley; Sheri Farr.

7:08 p.m. – Chad Whetzel opened up the workshop.

Dave Gibney – Alan wanted me to start here.

Alan Thomson – I’ve gotten a request. So everything in red is what we have gone over before and language that we agreed upon last time. Let’s just basically blaze right through the reds and if you see anything that you don’t like or we got wrong and then let’s flag that.

So for instance, on Page 19, under **Purpose** we have one word, “existing,” we’ve got “future,” we don’t need to spend any time on that so if everybody is okay with that we can just agree to that.

Dave Gibney – These aren’t track changes.

Alan Thomson – No, those aren’t track changes. It is the color of the font. I can do that after we have okayed this. We can just leave it there. So, is everyone okay with the red on this page? So, let’s move on. So, right down at the bottom there, under **Findings**, this is language that we crafted last time.

“The remainder of the land in Whitman County is rangeland and Channeled Scablands.”

All of the towns we have agreed upon. So, are there any comments on that? Any comments of the bottom of Page 18 and the rest of Page 19? At the bottom of Page 19, under **Agricultural Land** we talked about the loess on top of the high elevations and you okayed that.

“Very deep to moderately deep loess and colluvium sediment soils are found on buttes at higher elevations. These soils are usually used for dryland farming, rangeland, woodland, and wildlife habitat and makeup around 3 percent of the County.”

We talked in depth about the State’s definition of Prime farmland. So that is the same as last time. Is everyone okay with Page 20 under **Prime Agricultural Land**? At the bottom of Page 20 in purple this is language that you agreed upon last time.

“Farmland with this designation, while often steep in nature is still regarded as highly productive farmland in Whitman County.”

Keith Paulson – That’s true.

Brian Davies – Good, we got that in there.

Alan Thomson – So, on Page 21, on the left column, all that language in red, we just added “Agricultural District” at the bottom of that.

*“Agricultural Lands of Long-Term commercial Significance: Whitman County classifies all productive agricultural land outside of the Pullman urban growth area (including all prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance) as agricultural land of long-term commercial significance. These lands are regulated by the County’s **Agricultural District** zoning regulations.”*

Then the part in blue, under **Residential Land**, that was the original language from the consultant and you were all okay with that.

“Overall, around 45 percent of residential units in Whitman County are single-family detached homes. An additional 25 percent are in small multifamily structures with fewer than 20 units. (Note: this includes the primary population centers of Pullman and Colfax, which contain nearly all the attached housing in Whitman County. Unincorporated Whitman County has no multifamily housing units.)”

Under Cluster Residential we added some stuff here so read through that.

Page 21- Cluster Residential

*“Land zoned for cluster residential development in accordance with Whitman County Code and the policies in this Chapter can be found both within and outside the area governed by the tax sharing agreement with the City of Pullman. (See Map 2) **See definition of tax sharing agreement in the Economic Development Element, page 62.**”*

Alan Thomson – I added on at the bottom a comment, what Debby Snell from The Port said, that if we are talking about the tax sharing area we should give a definition. And it is further along in the document. So this is just saying, “see the definition of tax sharing on page 62.” It is in the Economic Development Element.

We had to clarify the part about “New cluster residential zones are prohibited within the area defined by the Whitman County and City of Pullman’s Tax Sharing Agreement **dated June 29, 2015.**” So that is the last part there in red.

The next paragraph was added:

*“**There is currently 384 acres of cluster development approved for or developed upon within the Pullman tax sharing area. No additional cluster developments are allowed within the Pullman tax sharing area. There is an additional 141 acres outside the tax sharing area that is available for cluster development.**”*

Okay, so we did have a conversation about “are” and “is.” But we settled on “is.” Does everybody agree that should be “are?”

Chad Whetzel – Well, there is currently 384 acres. But the acres is not what they are talking about. They are talking about cluster development. Cluster Development is singular so there is,

Dave Gibney – No, the 384 acres is plural. There are currently a multiple number of acres approved for development. The subject is plural, it is the acres.

Chad Whetzel – No, the subject is cluster development.

Alan Thomson - Yes that would make sense. I think I agree with Dave. The subject seems to be 384 acres. The first subject is plural, 384 acres.

Chad Whetzel – You could drop the 384 acres and still have a complete sentence. “There is cluster approved for development.”

Alan Thomson – In that case, cluster development is singular. That would make sense. The subject seems to be 384 acres. There is also a cluster but the first subject is plural, 384 acres.

Chad Whetzel – Sure, go with it.

Alan Thomson – I don’t know if that it is that important, but,

Chad Whetzel – I’d like the next person that gets on the Board to be an English major, please?

Alan Thomson – We will have to go over this again and maybe we can get an English major to approve this once we are finished with it.

Brian Davies – You could say, “Currently, 384 acres are available for development.”

Dave Gibney - But that’s not true, either. The sentence is still kind of awkward. *“There **are** currently 384 acres of cluster development approved for or developed upon within the Pullman tax sharing area.”*

Alan Thomson – That makes sense, Dave.

Dave Gibney – Yes, it does. Now this bit right here is a repeating of this right here. This is stronger and more correct. I don’t think you want this bit. (Note from clerk: I have no idea what “bit” he is talking about!)

Alan Thomson – What say the rest of the Board?

Chad Whetzel – Which was the second bit, I missed that?

Dave Gibney – It is highlighted right now. Over there at the bottom of Page 21, we have, *“New cluster residential zones are prohibited within the area defined by the Whitman County and City of Pullman’s*

Tax Sharing Agreement dated June 29, 2015.” Then, we say it again. We don’t need to say it twice within a dozen words of each other.

Matt Webb - Doesn’t it sound like it should say *“There **are** currently 384 acresand there **is** an additional....”* Wouldn’t that sound proper?

Alan Thomson – What are you saying about striking the duplication? Where is that? The language in red at the bottom of Page 21, keep that there. Then Dave, when you had that highlighted, “no additional cluster developments are allowed....”

Dave Gibney – I think we need to strike this.

Alan Thomson – It is repetitive.

Dave Gibney – Then this is the part that we struck, are you still keeping “was a major,”

Alan Thomson – Yes, that is,

“Cluster residential development was the subject of public engagement discussion during the comprehensive planning process.”

Dave Gibney – Except that really ought to be the previous or before. We didn’t, we have not done a lot of cluster residential engagement during this current process with the public.

Alan Thomson – We have discussed it a little bit. I think we need to discuss it a little bit more. One of the major questions that remains unanswered, is there a desire to increase the area of the Cluster Residential Opportunity Zones? I don’t know if we have answered that question.

Dave Gibney – Maybe we will do that. Next time we meet here let’s have the track changes as it is going to look.

Alan Thomson – I’ll do that for the next meeting. I will go over this after we have agreed upon things tonight and make this much tidier. Then all the track changes changed and all the highlights changed and everything will just be regular language.

Dave Gibney – And the notes out there gotten rid of. We are at Page 22, Rural Communities. Mark has wording for here and I guess you didn’t get it yet. You have wording here.

Alan Thomson – Yes that is added in. So read this. This is different from the last version.

*“The twelve unincorporated communities in Whitman County (listed on page 16 of this element) are home to a mix of residential and commercial uses. The zoning is a mixture of Rural Community Residential District (**RCR**), Rural Community Center District (**RCC-1**), Rural Community Commercial District (**RCC-2**), and the **Agricultural District.**”*

I added in the RCR, the RCC-1, the RCC-2 and the Agricultural District. That was not in the last version. That aligns with the development codes.

Dave Gibney – This next bit here.

“The Pullman-Moscow Corridor continues to be a priority area for commercial and industrial development in unincorporated Whitman County. This Plan contains several goals and policies in this Element and in the Economic Development Element, to encourage continued commercial and industrial development within the Pullman-Moscow Corridor.”

Alan Thomson – That aligns with what we want to do in the corridor.

Dave Gibney – And somebody checked our numbers and this is what used to be grain elevators on Page 22 under **Commercial and Industrial Land?**

“The County is also home to twelve Commercial Agricultural Commodity Warehouses. These uses continue to play a vital role in the County’s agricultural economy and are located at key points along rail and road transportation corridors (see Map 5.) These facilities are mapped in the Transportation Element.

Alan Thomson – Yes, so now they are Commercial Agricultural Commodity Warehouses. That is what the definition of a commercial grain elevator is in the code.

Dave Gibney – Do we in parenthesis put “Grain elevators?”

Alan Thomson – You need to make it “Commercial Grain Elevators,” not just grain elevators.

Matt Webb – So you must just be counting the companies that are doing grain elevators? Not individual elevators by each company, because like PNW has several.

Alan Thomson – Well, they have to be commercial, even though it is a single. Is that considered a commercial one, still?

Weston Kane – Inland Empire Milling has one in Pleasant Valley, one in Pine City and one in St. John. So, there are three right there. You are just saying the 12 main companies have several? Is that right?

Matt Webb - That would be where I am going with that.

Dave Gibney – I thought we were counting 12 different sites.

Alan Thomson – That is what this sentence suggests.

Matt Webb – Just off the top of my head, I added up about 27-28 around the County and I know I missed a few.

Alan Thomson – How about this? *“The County is also home to twelve Commercial Agricultural Commodity Warehouse/**businesses.**”*

Matt Webb – That would be more accurate.

Alan Thomson – The PNW commercial businesses out there. They have twelve businesses and they have multiple sites. I think it would be hard to figure out how many exactly are out there.

Dave Gibney – Okay, there is one more red area here.

“Heavy commercial uses in Whitman County include businesses providing sales or services related to transportation, construction, warehousing, or agriculture in locations where these uses are likely to have minimal impact on surrounding uses.”

Alan Thomson – We discussed that last time. We were okay with that.

Keith Paulson – Behind the warehouse we had storage facilities. Because PNW down there at Dusty, that isn't a warehouse. That is a storage facility. They are just open bins, no buildings.

Alan Thomson – Well, Keith, that was Commissioner Kinzer who came up with this definition. So that is what a commercial elevator is, a grain operation is according to the code. He called it a warehouse so we went with it.

Matt Webb – So, we are going back to this warehouse and it is actually each business has several warehouses.

Alan Thomson – What we want to highlight there is there are 12 businesses out there that have commercial grain elevators for the County. Twelve businesses is what we are trying to figure out here. Not how many elevators there are out there, but who are the businesses, the PNW's, etc.? So far, twelve is what the consultant has come up with. Twelve business operations. That is how that is meant to read. If you have a suggestion as to how to write it better,

Chad Whetzel – Commodity storage would be more accurate than warehouse.

Alan Thomson – Well, that is actually codified, Chad. That is actually in the code as a definition of a commercial warehouse. We would have to change that under Chapter 19.03 in the definitions.

Chad Whetzel – We probably have to change it then because open air storage is not a warehouse.

Alan Thomson – Well, that is a discussion for another night. We can figure that one out later on.

Dave Gibney – Okay, I got some tweet there. We can get here again. What is new and different here, Alan, under **Designation of Mineral Resource Lands**.

Alan Thomson – I don't think there is anything different. That was what we looked at last time and you were fine with this the last time so, I'm thinking that is going to be okay.

Under **Renewable Energy** at the bottom of Page 23, we talked about the Town of Oakesdale and that is what you agreed on. Then we talked about the Snake and Columbia Rivers and you were okay with that paragraph.

Okay, next is Rail Banking and we have Art's statement in here. I was wondering if you wanted to massage that a little bit. We can have a discussion about that right now.

“Railroad and the associated railbeds are essential transportation corridors for freight and people in Whitman County. The County supports the active use of rail transportation in Whitman County and those measures needed to keep the railroads viable.

Should a railroad corridor be determined to no longer be a viable freight and rail transportation route, an objective evaluation must be conducted to consider the merits of abandonment versus preservation. Such evaluation shall protect the rights of private property owners while also considering the public interest in preservation of each individual rail corridor as to future use as a transportation or public infrastructure corridor. The County may employ any legal and ethical method to preserve essential corridors to include methods such as railbanking.”

Dave Gibney – I think Art has pretty good language there.

Alan Thomson – Does everyone agree?

Chad Whetzel – So what other methods are there to preserve that besides rail banking?

Alan Thomson – It's WSDOT rail who decides to leave it as is. It is actually an active railroad right now according to what WSDOT was saying. There are not any trains being used there but apparently it is still active.

Chad Whetzel – When Art talks about *“The County may employ any legal and ethical method to preserve essential corridors to include methods such as rail banking.”* Are there any other systems besides railbanking to preserve them?

Dave Gibney – Doing nothing is a thing to do.

Alan Thomson – I think what Art is trying to do is, if DOT decides to rail bank it, then that language would be pertinent. But DOT could sit on it too.

Dave Gibney – It might also be, and I'm not speaking for the County or anyone else, but if DOT or the railroad or somebody else decides to actively unload or revert it then legal opposition or something like that would be another method of asking the attorney to oppose that. I'm not saying that is the way it would go. But there are things besides rail banking, one of which would be litigation or outright purchase of it by the County. There are several ways, railbanking being the major one.

Alan Thomson – Chad, there are two options that Art seems to be focused on when you consider the merits of abandonment versus preservation. Abandonment back to the underlying landowners, or preserving it as a corridor for a potential trail. Rail banking it.

Chad Whetzel – I am just wondering under the subheading of railbanking if we need to have, “such as railbanking.” You could just say, “The County may employ any legal and ethical method to preserve essential corridors.” It is under the title of rail banking.

Brian Davies – I think that would simplify since we are already mentioning railbanking.

Dave Gibney – I think that closes this section well. That didn't do a track change.

Alan Thomson – I cut and pasted that in.

Dave Gibney – Okay, you can take it out if you want.

Alan Thomson – Are you striking that last part in red? Is that what you are doing?

Dave Gibney – That was a suggestion. Personally I disagree with the suggestion, but,

Chad Whetzel – Whatever, we can carry on.

Alan Thomson – Are we going to strike that part in yellow? That was what the consultant wrote.

“The Whitman County Comprehensive Plan supports the use of rail banking to preserve currently unused rail easements for future use while allowing other uses, including agriculture and recreational trails, for example, to use those spaces on a temporary basis until such time as they are needed again for rail transport. This approach is preferable to permanent abandonment of rail easements.”

Dave Gibney – I kind of like them both there, but,

Alan Thomson – Keep them both in?

Chad Whetzel – I like Art's a little better because he talks about making sure it is legal and ethical. That one just says we are going to do it. I'd say strike the second one.

Matt Webb – When you say “ethical” it depends on which side of the coin you are on, doesn't it?

Chad Whetzel – Well, there is that.

Matt Webb – Are you the person with the land that it's going through on the other side of it?

Weston Kane – That kind of leaves it open depending on the situation. Whereas the other one says that this is the way it is.

Alan Thomson – The County is taking a position here with this language that we are remaining open to the possibility of rail banking. We are not making a decision on rail banking, we are just leaving it open to a possibility of. So, then the rest of you, do you all agree to striking that?

Weston Kane – I do.

Alan Thomson – Okay, so this is as far as we got last time was to the Goals and we covered Framework Goal – Protection of Private Property Rights, Framework Goal-Preserve Farms and Agricultural Character, and we got down to Land Use Goals and Policies. That is where we left off last time.

Lisa Carloye – Thank you, I just wanted to go back to the rail banking statement. I had read those two statements as actually saying different things. I think the part you wanted to strike in yellow is talking about priorities or goals of the County as opposed to mechanics of preservation. I would advocate for leaving that in.

I think it helps strengthen it to specify that preserving the rail corridor is a priority for the County and rail banking is the only way to do that besides the State holding on to it unless the County could buy it. There really isn't another method for preserving the rail corridors beyond using them as rail corridors.

Dave Gibney – For what it's worth, I liked it better with both of the statements there.

Chad Whetzel – I think one of the issues too, that we had last time was that second sentence where it says *"...including agricultural and recreational trails."* I made the suggestion that it needs to not interfere with current agricultural practices, the rail banking. Because you can't do a rail bank and have an agricultural trail. I'm not sure how that works. That was my comment a couple of meetings ago.

Alan Thomson – Well, Chad, wasn't the agricultural use, the right-of-way for the railroad is for the most part 100 feet? If you put a trail in there it is only a small portion,

Chad Whetzel – A couple of meetings ago, we were talking about that sentence where it says, *"...including agricultural and recreational trails."*

Dave Gibney – And the consultants asked, "What is an agricultural trail?" We basically came up with the Ag people can conceivably use the trail as access to the Ag land.

Alan Thomson – Okay Chad, I think I see what you are saying. So, *"...while allowing other uses including agriculture/and recreational trails."* I don't think it was meant to read as an agricultural trail.

Chad Whetzel – Right.

Dave Gibney – I agree.

Alan Thomson – So let's make it clear that it is not an agricultural trail.

Chad Whetzel – You could say something like, *"...agricultural **access and** recreational trails."*

Dave Gibney – I'm going to point out that if we do strike this stuff in red, there is a stronger argument to keep the part in yellow. Personally, I like all of that language in both. It gives some reasoning, some flexibility. It definitely says we are going to protect the rights of the adjacent landowners and yet we do support the idea of trails when it's appropriate.

Brian Davies – I agree.

Alan Thomson – Again, we are not advocating anything definite here. That is not the objective of the comp plan. It could go either way. It could go back to the landowners, it could stay with DOT, or it could be a trail. All of those options are on the table.

Chad Whetzel – Right, I think that is a better set up there. The question also, from Karen, was that the heading originally said, “Railroads,” not just “Rail Banking” and if we keep all that information, it should not just say “Rail Banking,” because we are talking about preservation of rails.

Alan Thomson – Okay, do you want to change that heading?

Chad Whetzel – Rail lines, or whatever you want to call it.

Brian Davies – Railways and Rail Banking.

Alan Thomson – Are we striking that red or are we keeping that in?

Brian Davies – I think we should keep it in. My opinion.

Chad Davies – I’m fine with putting it back in.

Alan Thomson – Okay, let’s move on.

Keith Paulson – I have a quick question about abandonment. Are there many railways that have been abandoned?

Alan Thomson – I don’t know how to answer that one, Keith.

Dave Gibney – I don’t think there is a lot but there have been a few of them that have been proposed.

Alan Thomson – I think the one in Colfax, if I am remembering correctly there was a dispute, I think it was abandoned because the landowners were using it as their access to their homes and there was a legal challenge on that. That might have been abandoned.

Matt Webb – If you go up around Tekoa there are some there that were abandoned in the 90’s as well.

Brian Davies – In Uniontown I think there are some siding’s. I’m not completely sure but I believe that the Uniontown Cooperative bought the siding that used to exist adjacent to the property in the north side of Uniontown and I believe there was a siding in Leon that was sold to the adjacent property owners after the tracks were taken out.

Keith Paulson – I was thinking that when DOT takes out a road, like we had a road that has been taken out and we had to buy back a little bit because it was abandoned and we wanted to have it because we farm across it. So it was sort of the same thing with the railroad that would go to the landowner who has land on both side of the railroad to buy it back. I was just trying to see if they were the same things.

Alan Thomson – They are to an extent, the last part you just said is true. If the railroad does get abandoned and vacated completely, it goes to the landowner on the north side and the other half to the landowner on the south side. Abandonment also has a slightly different meaning with railroads. It is part of the process of going to rail banking. From what I understand, is you have to abandon it first but that doesn’t mean it goes back to the landowner. So, it is slightly different than a road. There is a process to rail bank it apparently and you have to abandon it before you can rail bank it.

Lisa Carloye – Actually that is not true. The rail banking process doesn't require abandonment. You file an intent to abandon with the STB, the Service Transportation Board. Then, basically rail banking averts to actual abandonment, the consummation of the abandonment. So, if it is actually abandoned it is abandoned and it goes back to whatever the deed underlying properties say, but you don't actually abandon it for rail banking. That actually prevents it from being abandoned and preserves it.

Alan Thomson – That is a good clarification. Thank you.

Dave Gibney – To answer Keith's question, it does happen but not too often.

Alan Thomson – Let's abandon that conversation and move on. So we've got language that we have agreed upon from that point backwards so we now we move forward.

Page 25 - Land Use Goals and Policies

The left-hand column at the bottom, the part that was struck out, I think we all agreed that we are not going to use the wording, "family farms." That is the current comp plan language. Are we all agree that we can eliminate that? Okay,

***Policy LU-1.1** – The County **should** to the greatest extent feasible, update the inventory of agricultural land and prime agricultural land **and farmland of statewide importance** in the County **in** accordance with NRCS soil surveys.*

Weston Kane – I hate to bring up a conservation that took so long in the last meeting but we don't have "the farmlands of statewide importance" in there. If we go on prime farmlands by the NRCS you would throw out half the County.

Dave Gibney – Does that make everybody a little happier? So we at some point we agree to strike the next one which talks about "non-farm residential uses."

Alan Thomson - Yes, that is old language in the current comp plan right now and we all agree that wasn't necessary to be in there. So, we have a new one next in line.

***Policy LU 1.2** – The County should encourage residential growth in designated unincorporated communities, areas adjacent to towns and cities, and those areas designated for Cluster Residential development.*

Chad Whetzel – On that other one, the prime agricultural land, that shouldn't be capitalized?

Dave Gibney – It seems to me that all three should or all three shouldn't be capitalized.

Chad Whetzel – Agricultural Land though in general, is generalized where prime agricultural land is something specific and so is farmland of statewide importance.

"...inventory of agricultural land, Prime Agricultural Lane, and Farmland of Statewide Importance...."

Chad Whetzel – That looks right.

Dave Gibney – Okay, and the bit crossed out is what it used to be.

Policy LU-1.2 – *The County should encourage residential growth in designated unincorporated communities, areas adjacent to towns and cities, and those areas designated for Cluster Residential development.*

Policy LU-1.3 – *The County should allow residential land use on agricultural lands in the form of primary residences, secondary residential units on existing home sites and short plats as allowed under the development regulations, and those areas designated for Cluster Residential Development.*

Alan Thomson – On the **LU-1.2** at the end we have “...those areas designated for Cluster Residential Development. And we have that at the end of **LU-1.3**. Aren’t we repeating ourselves with the **LU-1.3** at the end, “...and those areas designated for Cluster Residential Development.” We have repeated that twice.

Dave Gibney – Actually “...as allowed under the development regulations...” is separate from “...designated for Cluster Residential Development.”

Alan Thomson – Does everybody agree to what those policies say now or point to?

Chad Whetzel – So we did decide that you could have two residences?

Alan Thomson – Just because it is in the comp plan allows us to do so in the development regulations. So, that is just giving us the authority to have up to two houses on a parcel but the development regulations don’t match that yet.

Dave Gibney – It does say that two residences can be allowed.

Chad Whetzel – So, back to the **LU-1.3**, we have, “The County should allow residential land use on agricultural lands in the form of primary residences, secondary...and short plats...” Oh, okay, I’m fine.

Keith Paulson – It says, “...secondary residential units...” that means there can be more than just one? Secondary?

Alan Thomson – No.

Keith Paulson – Shouldn’t it just say, “unit?”

Alan Thomson – Don’t you think that is a general term? It’s not specific that we,

Dave Gibney – It flows better with the plurals there.

Alan Thomson – Yes, I wouldn’t read that as meaning you could have a whole bunch of units. It is just a generalization.

Brian Davies – We’re not writing code here, either.

Keith Paulson – My business is storage units, not storage unit. It just looked funny to me is all I’m saying. I can go either way. It doesn’t matter to me. It sounds like it is plural with two units.

Alan Thomson – Okay, so Keith, the last part of that sentence, “...as allowed under the development regulations.” So it is pointing to what the development regulations are going to say. Technically then, we could have units but that is not what the development regulations are really going to say. It is going to specify, spell out, that you are allowed one residential main or two residential main homes or in the development regulations, that’s where the detail comes in.

Keith Paulson – Okay, that’s fine.

Dave Gibney – I guess in the long run you could do those development regulations to allow a half dozen tiny homes or something like that. I’m not saying you will, but this gives you more flexibility and that is probably a good thing.

Policy LU-1.4 – The County should create a process within the development regulations to allow for additional rural residential uses, including secondary single-family structures and bunkhouses, within the footprint of existing home sites without a short plat mechanism to allow flexibility for farm residents and strengthen family farm enterprises.

Policy LU-1.5 – The County should ensure that any residential development is accessed from an improved County or State Road.

Alan Thomson – In **LU-1.5** it is important because there are dirt roads out there that we do not allow for development off of the dirt roads if they are closed for several months in the year.

Chad Whetzel – One of the things we should add back in is the part about adequate access for emergency vehicles. Because something that you can drive a Prius over doesn’t mean you can drive a fire engine over.

Alan Thomson – Okay Chad, if Mark were here, you would say that those roads, the gravel roads, regardless of how “iffy” they are, the gravel roads are supposed to be open to development. So, I would balk at having language in there.

Chad Whetzel – You are saying “...accessed from an improved county road...” but the way that I read it the first time was that whether you have a culvert or a bridge or whatever, so if you have an area where you are developing it and you have to put a bridge and that part of the bridge would have to be rated for the equipment.

Alan Thomson – Are you specifically talking about Enman-Kincaid Road?

Dave Gibney – No, he, give me a minute. He is basically saying leave this bit down here at the bottom.

Alan Thomson - All of the gravel roads should be accessible for emergency vehicles.

Dave Gibney – Just because I have an easement off of a regular county road, and my driveway is there, that doesn't mean that it is good enough for the emergency people to get to my house.

Alan Thomson – You're just talking about your driveway now, which is different from the actual road.

Chad Whetzel – Right, but the access is part of the road system because it is within the right-of-way, correct?

Alan Thomson – When you say the access, are you talking about a driveway?

Chad Whetzel – Yes, the driveway, but within the county right-of-way. That is the access.

Alan Thomson – Okay, so the driveway has to be treated differently Chad, because that is private property. Then the development regulations, if you have three houses accessing the same driveway, then the building codes and the fire codes say that you have to improve that access up to county road standards for emergency vehicles. That is the third home, there are three homes on one driveway. One home or two homes, that is not so. We don't cover driveways for emergency access. People can build a goat trail if they want. That is up to them. That is not our policy to intervene there. But the road itself has to be accessible to all vehicles, unless it is closed in the winter for heavy vehicles.

Dave Gibney – Is there harm in having this read like it says? ~~“Ensure access from an improved County or State road and demonstrate adequate access for emergency services without increasing the cost of liability of the County for road maintenance costs.”~~

Alan Thomson – I don't like it to be honest with you, because it implies that some gravel roads are not adequate for emergency services. That is not true.

Weston Kane – The other thing I would say, would imply, is to take a road like Bob Schultz Road that is accessible by a lot of vehicles but does not meet code and I know there is a house going in there and they are widening that in there to meet the improved status. So I think it is a little bit redundant, myself.

Alan Thomson – Up to that part of Bob Schultz Road, that is a gravel road that is accessible to emergency vehicles. The County is asking them to improve the access point of going in there so that is something that the County Road Department can do.

Dave Gibney – This ~~“...and demonstrate adequate access...”~~ is after it is an improved county or state road. That ~~“and demonstrate,”~~ does not weaken the earlier clause.

Weston Kane – But it is redundant because if it is an improved county or state road it already can be accessed by emergency service.

Alan Thomson – That is my point.

Dave Gibney – Okay.

Chad Whetzel – Alan, you said you can build a goat trail. So, if you build on a piece of property where your power came in just off the road they could have a walking trail up to their house?

Alan Thomson – If parking is just off the road and not in the right-of-way, for a single family residence, yes. The responsibility is the landowner's. The landowner can build a driveway and they can build it any way they want for one single family home or two homes that are accessing the same part of the driveway. We do not have a regulation that covers access to one home or two homes under the building codes and fire codes.

Dave Gibney – Chad might be saying that he would like us to have it but,

Alan Thomson – But that is the fire codes and building codes that govern that one. That is the way that it stands at the moment in time.

Brian Davies – There's not development standards in subdivision language that covers that sort of stuff?

Alan Thomson – We don't do subdivisions Brian, so no, we don't have that kind of language.

Brian Davies – So, there is no subdivision section that has that street or road language?

Alan Thomson – Only in cluster development. Yes, there is in that case but not for a short plat for one house or two houses.

Dave Gibney – I can probably make the extrapolation that if you were to add subdivisions to your development standards you would include emergency vehicle access.

Alan Thomson – In those subdivision ordinances, yes. That is a standard thing within towns. You have to have the roads adequately built.

Brian Davies – With the roads, radius, all that stuff has to be done, the emergency service criteria.

Alan Thomson – Keep in mind that WC does not allow long plats. That would be a subdivision of six parcels or more and we don't allow that. So we don't need that kind of regulation such as you would get in the town.

Dave Gibney – If you were to change that, then you would.

Alan Thomson – Yes, and the development regulations would have to include that. Just like with the Hawkins project. That was going to be a major development, if it ever happened, which it is not going to, but there would have to be sufficient access and roads and all the other stuff that is normal for a large subdivision like that.

Dave Gibney – So, **LU-1.5** is actually unchanged from before.

Alan Thomson – That is original comp plan language.

Policy LU-1.6 – *The County should require that all levels of governments and their agencies consider the impact their programs and projects may have on agricultural activities and seek to minimize any impacts that threaten the viability of agriculture.*

Dave Gibney – Sounds fine to me.

Chad Whetzel – If you clean ditches, don't do it just before harvest.

Dave Gibney – We are basically saying to the State and Federal people if you are going to build a big office building, don't do it on our prime agricultural land. That is how this one is intended to read.

So, **Policy 1.6**?

Brian Davies – Sounds good to me.

Chad Whetzel – What they define is in the footprint of existing home sites.

Alan Thomson – What that suggests to me is if you have a platted area that would be that but also, a developed area. So if you have a farmstead you've got a house and a machine shed, a barn, shop or whatever within the developed area.

Chad Whetzel – So, it is not saying it has to be within so many feet of another house or anything like that.

Alan Thomson – It is basically the building codes and also environmental health to decide the distance between buildings. Mostly the fire code and whatnot. We don't make that distinction in the development regulations.

Chad Whetzel – One question also is, I am agreeing with what you have there but before that you had the sentence that was talking about secondary homes and now you are talking about the mechanism. Should the mechanism be before we discuss the fact that there could be secondary homes? That was up in **Policy LU-1.3**. It feels like we put the cart before the horse.

Dave Gibney – The main gist of this earlier discussion here was also to get this “and bunkhouses” in there. This says we should allow to do it and then this says and we should figure out how to do it.

Chad Whetzel – Yes, I agree with that. Should it be below right **1.3** instead of moving on to the access and the other stuff first?

Dave Gibney – That is a valid point. Okay, then this one is 5, and this one 6, and this one is still 7.

Chad Whetzel – That makes more sense having them closer together.

Alan Thomson – Yes.

Policy LU-1.7 – *The County may allow alternative forms of low-density residential development in unincorporated areas through Planned Residential Development in the Agricultural Zone to preserve prime farmland and environmentally sensitive areas.*

Brian Davies – Are we talking about a tiny home village?

Dave Gibney – That’s not low-density. I think you are trying to say the planned residential development can happen but I’m not sure what that means in the context of this. I think all of this in 1.7 has been covered in 1.3 and 1.4.

Alan Thomson – Actually, Dave, it isn’t. I need to give you some clarification here in 1.7. There potentially could be a different kind of development in the County, on the former Hawkins property, now owned by the Druffels. That would be a PRD, Planned Residential Development, so this needs to be in here to allow the Druffels that potential. Because we don’t have that ability anywhere else in the County and the reason that the Druffels land is different is because they have a water right.

Dave Gibney – But they’re not in the Ag zone, either are they?

Alan Thomson – That area is in the Ag zone.

Dave Gibney – Isn’t that the Corridor?

Alan Thomson – Part of it is. What is going to happen there is that it will be re-zoned to PRD if it ever comes to fruition? So, that is mainly why that language is in there to allow that possibility.

Dave Gibney – Okay, why do we have “*alternative forms*” there instead of just saying, “*The County should allow low density residential development in unincorporated areas through Planned Residential Development in the Ag zone...*” What are the alternative forms?

Alan Thomson – We don’t do, a single family residence is basically very low density. That is basically what happens in the County. But alternative forms of low density, so the PRD that we have in mind here is going to be somewhat low density. It’s not going to be something that you would see in a city. It is an alternative form, alternative because we don’t allow it right now.

Chad Whetzel – You said the Hawkins development is the only place that could happen?

Alan Thomson – It is because of the water. You couldn’t do this anywhere else in the County unless you have a water right.

Chad Whetzel – Is there any place else in the County that does have a water right?

Alan Thomson – Not to my knowledge. Because this is dry land wheat country. There are some water rights out there but I’m not aware of anybody else that would have the same capacity as the Druffels.

Chad Whetzel – Because most of that stuff runs up against Moscow on the state line, correct?

Alan Thomson – Right.

Chad Whetzel – If somebody has a water right out in Ewan do we want to have that same thing happening out there in the middle of the Ag area or,

Alan Thomson – There is that possibility. We do have an attempted PRD out by Rock Lake. It was done 15-20 years ago. It never got developed but it operated without a water right and it had to be done by an exempt well, 5,000 gallons a day and eight lots were actually created out there and each one of them

would have to have a share of 5,000 gallons a day. So, yes, it is possible that that could happen somewhere else but that area would have to be changed to a PRD, which the development regulations would control.

Dave Gibney – If it was feasible out there would it be a bad thing, especially if we have that clause there that we still want to preserve our farm land? If somebody came up with a water right to do it out in the scablands or something, what would be wrong with it?

Alan Thomson – Right, it is not prime farm land out there by Rock Lake for sure.

Chad Whetzel – I guess that was a poor choice of places. You drive out Latah County out in the country and all of a sudden you're right in the middle of a manufactured home park. It happens all over the place out there. Is that what we want to encourage?

Alan Thomson – Idaho has different water regulations.

Chad Whetzel – I realize that but that was what I was asking is if something along those lines can happen with what we are putting together.

Alan Thomson – It could happen but ultimately it comes down to the decision of the Planning Commission and the BOCC who have to change the zone to a PRD. The BOCC has to agree to the Druffels if they want that kind of development out there, which they have not at this point because we are not even close to that point. So, it would be a decision by the BOCC.

Chad Whetzel – Also, I wanted to make sure we weren't tailoring something to one specific person.

Alan Thomson – No, so that answers Dave's question. It would be open to anywhere in the County if they have water.

Keith Paulson – There a lot of farmers who have water rights for irrigation. Can that be turned over to buildings?

Alan Thomson – Not necessarily. So, if you are watering livestock there is no limit and that is under the exempt well status that talks about livestock and no limitations. You would have to convert something like that to a new use such as residential and that goes through the DOE. Judging from the difficulty that the Hawkins people had in converting some of those water rights, it is a very arduous task. To be honest with you, a well that is watering stock, I don't think is appropriate. It wouldn't work.

Chad Whetzel – I think that a lot of the water rights are usually coming out of a river, creek someplace and the Department of Ecology is going to stop you.

Keith Paulson –At Pine City, there are artisan wells which a lot of the families have and that is a free flowing well.

Dave Gibney – I'm going to ask again, if somebody came up with a proposal and they had the water and they could convince the Planning Commission and the BOCC that it was a good idea to build a dozen houses here, what is wrong with that? This is what allows it.

Brian Davies – That’s what happened with the Hawkins thing. The BOCC lost their jobs over it. There has to be a need for something like that and if a landowner that believes that they have a need and have the pockets deep enough to pull off the engineering then, do we allow that to happen?

Alan Thomson- Well, this has to go before the BOCC before much longer and they have to make a decision if that is what they want to happen here. Ultimately they choose and so I’ll ask them about this. But the language is in here right now and the BOCC have a chance to review it.

Dave Gibney – Could we soften it a bit and make it, “*The County **may** allow...*” rather than “*should?*”

Keith Paulson – I was thinking, “*The County **could** allow...*”

Chad Whetzel – I think “may” is more technically correct.

Weston Kane – I agree with “may.”

Brian Davies – I agree, too, with “may.”

Dave Gibney – Let’s see how we can beat up **1.8**.

Policy LU-1.8 – *The County should allow land in the Agriculture zone to be rezoned to a different use only if it is consistent with the goals and policies of this Plan and with the criteria in the development regulations.*

Alan Thomson – Dave, you know about this because you went through this, trying to rezone some stuff. And the claim that this is a spot zone, which is illegal as far as zoning is concerned, unless it is mentioned in the comp plan. That is why that is in there.

Dave Gibney – Basically that right there says that if that PRD out in the middle of nowhere is not being consistent we are not going to let it happen. If it is, we will.

Alan Thomson – Yes, that’s right. Everybody okay with **1.8**?

Dave Gibney – That brings us to our next goal.

Alan Thomson – Wow, we are making progress.

Goal LU-2 – *Allow and encourage development of compatible businesses in agricultural areas to serve farmers as well as to diversify employment opportunities in the region.*

Does that sound okay?

Brian Davies – Yes.

Policy LU-2.1 – *The County should encourage creative, compatible, and beneficial use of resource lands other than agriculture to supplement the income of farm families. Such uses may include: tourism, mining, quarrying, boating, hunting/fishing, recreation, nursery, and renewable energy development.*

Dave Gibney – This one is probably the original language. I don't know if renewable energy is there.

Alan Thomson – Yes, we did change that. That was a comp plan amendment so that is in the current comp plan.

Dave Gibney – He had to get that in there to get the wind going.

Alan Thomson – So that is an important one to keep in there.

Policy LU-2.2 – *The County should allow and encourage home-based businesses as an accessory use in agricultural and rural residential area through administrative use or conditional use permits, depending on the extent of potential impact on surrounding properties.*

Dave Gibney – This says home based business is good if isn't going to impact.

Alan Thomson – We have a process for impacts. Conditional uses and administrative uses in the development codes.

Policy LU-2.3 – *The County should encourage the development of renewable energy facilities where feasible.*

Dave Gibney – A bunch of this is stuff we just went through.

Chad Whetzel – There is a new goal.

Goal LU-3 – *Protect current and future mineral resource lands by minimizing conflicts between these uses and surrounding uses.*

Dave Gibney – Actually if you look at that this right here was what we discussed, although we moved it further up. All of this stuff got moved up into one which is why it is deleted here.

Alan Thomson – We are now into resource lands. Protecting mineral resources, basically. This is all original language in the current comp plan that we struck out.

Goal LU-3.1 – *The County will encourage the retention and protection of long-term mineral resource sites of commercial grade aggregate for new development, roads, and other uses.*

Chad Whetzel – I assume to clarify there, commercial grade does not limit it to commercial use. It can be for public use, correct?

Alan Thomson - When you say for public use, you mean what way?

Chad Whetzel – Well, like if the County is mining the rock to use for gravel roads or new roads, and,

Dave Gibney – That is the quality of the gravel not the use of it.

Chad Whetzel – Correct, okay.

Policy LU-3.2 – Mining and extraction operations will be sited and designed to minimize conflicts with adjacent land uses and to minimize impacts on the environment.

Policy LU-3.3 – The County should consider the current and future boundaries of proposed mineral extraction and quarry uses in determining the appropriate distance to nearby uses under the development regulations for these uses.

Policy LU-3.4 – The County should evaluate minor expansions of existing quarries of less than 10 percent of the current quarry site where the expansion does not fall within 1,000 feet of a residence as permitted under the existing conditional or administrative use permit.

Policy LU-3.5 – Reclamation of mining and extraction sites is an integral part of mining operations and will be required and completed in a manner that will encourage future uses that are compatible with this Plan and any local comprehensive plans.

Dave Gibney – How does everyone feel about **Goals and Policies** through **3.5**? There are some notes over there from Matt.

Alan Thomson – Does anybody see any problems with **LU-3** and the **Policies**?

Keith Paulson – Sounds pretty good.

Brian Davies – Sounds good to me.

Weston Kane – Looks good.

Alan Thomson – I don't know what we've got right now. Okay, scroll down, Dave. We must be getting close.

Goal LU-4: Encourage the development of new industrial and commercial uses consistent with the rural character of the County as a means of supporting the long-term economic health of communities.

Policy LU-4.1 – The County should encourage industrial and commercial uses in incorporated cities and towns or rural communities; within the Pullman-Moscow Corridor; adjacent to and within the Port of Whitman County's industrial areas; and in agricultural areas where appropriate.

Policy LU-4.2 – The County should encourage industrial and commercial development in areas already zoned and developed for those uses, including in the Pullman-Moscow Corridor and the Port of Whitman County sites.

Policy LU 4.3 – The County should require proposed industrial and commercial uses seeking a zoning change to allow said uses to locate on sites that meet the criteria below:

- With access to an improved County or State road;

- *With sufficient area for large construction, parking access, transportation infrastructure and storage, including snow removal and storage areas;*
- *With adequate area to permit protection of critical areas and archeological sites;*
- *With adequate access for police, fire, and emergency services;*
- *With an adequate water supply and sewage disposal system to serve the full development and operation of the planned uses; and*
- *Where the proposed zone change meets the criteria for a rezone outlined in the County's development regulations and is consistent with other goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.*

Dave Gibney – I don't have any complaints about LU-4 and policies.

Alan Thomson – Some of this is actually in the current comp plan. **LU-4.3** essentially is in the current comp plan right now.

Dave Gibney – Is there anything that you or Mark would say is missing?

Alan Thomson – No, I kind of like it because it strengthens rezoning in the County. You look at the criteria and that is pretty clear. You have to have this criteria before you can rezone.

Chad Whetzel – What are the criteria for making a gravel road into a paved road?

Alan Thomson – Well, that is Mark Storey's roll, and so that is dependent on, there is a ranking for roads in the County and it has to do with Federal money and State money. The Federal transportation has a ranking there, and the County gets in touch with those people, and that they want to have this road paved or realigned or whatever. It depends on that situation because the County can't pay for all of that. They have to have State funding and Federal funding.

Chad Whetzel – The only reason I asked was because under LU-4.3 they're giving some of the specifics and the first bullet says, "*With access to an improved County or State road.*" I am just imagining a gravel road that meets the criteria and you suddenly have a large industrial area and some of those gravel roads aren't quite enough, especially in the Winter when the shoulders are soft, for a semi-truck and cars to go by. At what point does that get triggered?

Alan Thomson – The definition of an improved county road includes gravel roads. The exception is dirt roads.

Dave Gibney – Mark would tell you something about traffic counts or traffic studies, or the amount of use that is shown.

Brian Davies – They have to put counters and have all that data.

Chad Whetzel – Generally if something like that happened it would be within a quarter or half mile of the paved road. You have people living out there and all of a sudden the road is being trashed by excessive amount of truck traffic.

Keith Paulson – In the winter the County puts on road restrictions so they can't have the heavy loads out there.

Alan Thomson – Keep in mind the vehicle we are using for this would be a zone change. You would change it to an industrial or commercial area. The process to go through there is to go through the correct process. We'd have to evaluate the project and at that time if they can't come up to specs, the things that you were worried about Chad, are not taken care of like it is an inadequate road, it would never be approved for the zone change. Or they would have to improve the road.

Chad Whetzel – I'm thinking about some of the clusters, they started off with a gravel road and then they paved it and what is the trigger point there?

Alan Thomson – Funny you say that about Kitzmiller Road. I remember it being done back in the days when we were creating those clusters at that time and the infamous statement saying he would never pave that road. Well, never say never. So things like that can happen. That is not really a year round good paved road.

Chad Whetzel – It is a terrible paved road.

Alan Thomson – Exactly, but the county was,

Dave Gibney – So, again, is there anything that you would add to this? This is what we want the proposals to include if they want to put in a commercial or industrial site.

Alan Thomson – I already massaged this one and Mark's input. So if you guys are okay with this, this is okay with us.

Brian Davies – I'm okay with it.

Alan Thomson – So, let's move on. This is language that is currently in the comp plan.

Goal LU-5: - Encourage cooperation and communication with economic development boards, government agencies, and interested organizations on a regular basis to coordinate commercial and industrial land use and development activities.

Policy LU-5.1 – New industrial and commercial sites developed by and/or in cooperation with the Port of Whitman County should be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy LU-5.2 – The County should support the goals of the Port of Whitman County for economic diversification, opportunity, and stability county-wide.

Policy LU-5.3 – The County should support efforts by the Port of Whitman County and private broadband providers to expand availability of broadband internet service throughout Whitman County.

Policy LU-5.4 – *The County should coordinate with the Port of Whitman County to ensure a balanced and economic multimodal transportation system serving agriculture, commerce, and industry for competitive industrial transport.*

Goal LU-6:- *Provide basis for public and private decisions concerning siting of new heavy commercial land uses that may be desirable outside already developed incorporated areas.*

Policy LU-6.1 – *The County should encourage heavy commercial uses within the Heavy Commercial zone in accordance with the goals and policies of this plan, including but not limited to agricultural productivity, potential for conflict with surrounding uses, and potential for impacts to environmental and cultural resources.*

Goal LU-7: - *Promote a variety of industrial and commercial uses within the Pullman-Moscow corridor.*

Chad Whetzel – On **LU-5.3**, they are talking about the broadband internet service and all that fun stuff, is that something we really need to put in? Because my thought is already some of the new satellite providers are higher speed than some of the cable is.

Matt Webb – I believe you need to have that in there because the County’s already got the fiber buried and you could have a company coming in to support the fiber that is there to house that is already there. It should be used.

Chad Whetzel – Okay, I’ll buy that.

Brian Davies – It is dark fiber that is already installed in all the communities and now we are just waiting for the providers.

Chad Whetzel – I can just see tons of cable going in all over the countryside and it seems like there are better methods.

Matt Webb – I think they are finding there are going to be some issues maybe with some of the satellite stuff in comparison to being hard wired.

Dave Gibney – I wouldn’t expect the satellites to fully cover everything.

Policy LU-7.1 – *The County should continue supporting a mix of development for those areas zoned for commercial and industrial uses in the Pullman-Moscow Corridor, including retail, wholesale, and refined manufacturing.*

Policy LU- 7.2 – *The County should encourage continued public use and cooperative maintenance and improvements of the Bill Chipman Palouse Trail, including ensuring continuity of access to the trail at designated access points.*

Goal LU-8: *Minimize the impacts of major new facilities on adjacent uses.*

Policy LU-8.1 –*The County should monitor and coordinate closely with state and federal agencies in planning for major facilities including transmission lines, highways, major transportation facilities, reservoirs and other water projects, and similar state and federal projects.*

Chad Whetzel – My only question is that where it says in **LU-8.1** “...major facilities, including transmission lines, highways, major transportation facilities...” Should “highways” say “roadways?” There are state highways and all the county roads that could impact.

Alan Thomson – We could say, “...highways/roadways.”

Chad Whetzel – That would be fine.

Dave Gibney – If it is the County that is going to do it to a county road, this is coordinate with the State and Federal for these things.

Matt Webb –If the Federal or State comes in it will be a highway not just a little roadway, I would think.

Brian Davies – If the Federal highway administration is involved, probably, yes.

Dave Gibney – I think it is going to be awhile for Spokane to Lewiston as an interstate but, it could happen someday.

Alan Thomson – Read it this way, “*The county should monitor and coordinate closely with State and Federal agencies in planning for major facilities, including transmission lines **and** highways...*” I think that suggests building highways.

Brian Davies – That’s great.

Chad Whetzel – Okay.

Alan Thomson – Putting in the transmission lines, building highways, major transportation facilities, I think that,

Chad Whetzel – That makes more sense. If they are doing something major. Yes.

Alan Thomson – Okay, is everybody okay with **Goal LU-8**?

Matt Webb – Yes.

Brian Davies – Yes.

Alan Thomson – Let’s move on. What about this one?

Goal LU-9:- *Smaller local public facilities constructed to serve local energy needs should be located to minimize impacts on adjacent uses, including agriculture and residences.*

Brian Davies – Looks good to me.

Policy LU-9.1 – *The County should ensure that local facilities, including static transformers, storage facilities, and elements of the gas, power, and broadband transmission system, incorporate measures to minimize visual noise, light, and traffic impacts when adjacent to residential uses.*

Policy LU-9.2 – *The County should ensure that local facilities proposed adjacent to agricultural land uses minimize impacts on farm access and practices.*

Goal LU-10: - *Streamline permitting for communication facilities.*

Policy LU-10.1 – *The County should update its telecommunications regulations to ensure compliance with FCC regulations governing the permitting of small cell wireless communication facilities and Fiber to the Home (FTTH) projects.*

Dave Gibney – There is a comment here from Matt on **LU-10.1**. It might be moot or we have already done it.

Comment from the consultant: The county may have already done this; 2018 changes to FCC regulations have required many governments to update WCF regulations locally, so this should at least be looked at.

Alan Thomson – I don't know if we have. That is a Mark Storey one and I will flag one because I don't think we have addressed that. Well, congratulations we got through this,

Dave Gibney – I would suggest that somebody take a look at the maps.

Alan Thomson – Did you see something wrong with them?

Dave Gibney – No, I don't.

Alan Thomson – Okay, I'll check with the consultant. Well, this one on the Corridor District and whatnot in Pullman, I'm not sure that is the most current map we've got. I don't know if it is the most current map that Pullman has. You guys are annexing all the time.

Dave Gibney – I couldn't tell you for sure.

Alan Thomson – I'll have a chat with R.J. and ask him for the most current property lines of Pullman. I think that our tech guy, Jeff Marshall, is always updating the annexations on our systems.

Dave Gibney – It is more current that google, I'll tell you that.

Alan Thomson – We'll check.

Matt Webb – Looks like Lisa is trying to come in.

Lisa Carloye – I don't want to disrupt this conversation but I was going to drag you back to **Goal LU-7.**

Goal LU-7: - *Promote a variety of industrial and commercial uses within the Pullman-Moscow corridor.*

I noticed this before. I feel compelled to say, I really don't like the fact that this is saying the County should promote industrial and commercial development in the Corridor, without also balancing that with preserving esthetics and green spaces, as well, trying to balance the needs of those two. When I read this, I see a real push to develop that corridor from the city to city. I know lots of people that have been fighting against that for 50 years, trying to keep the cities separate and not just have that bleed.

I think that what has happened in the corridor has been selective and good to not disrupt that feeling of, "I've left Pullman, I'm in this beautiful rural environment, it is esthetically pleasing, there are green spaces, and the views are nice. Yes, I go past a gravel pit but that's okay. There is a nursery over there and that's fine."

I don't know, the stark language there just discourages me in the sense that it doesn't convey that value of green spaces. I like the early language. I don't know if it was associated with this but one of the original drafts had lots of language about preserving the rural character. To me, the language of this goal goes against that idea. It's not balanced. I don't know if there is anything you can do about that but I just wanted to register that.

Alan Thomson – It is registered and thank you. The BOCC gets to read all of this and hear the comments and basically right now that is a development corridor. That is the way it is set up but the BOCC will get these minutes and we can have a conversation with them and find out what they think.

Dave Gibney – The LU-7.2 is very specific to the Bill Chipman Palouse Trail and realistically we should know that the south side of the highway is less likely to have any additional development because of the environmental impact it would have.

Alan Thomson – The north side has inherent difficulties of development because of topography and the rock that is there.

Dave Gibney – Maybe you could add in a 7.3 of maintain some aesthetics, green space environmental concerns into that. We are not going to wordsmith it tonight.

Brian Davies – Let's get a footnote in there or something that we can come back to and add something to that. I think the key to the development of the Pullman-Moscow Corridor is going to be as Alan says, water. That will drive development or it will mitigate development.

Alan Thomson – The reality is Lisa, is that I think at some point in time, years from now, that will all be part of Pullman. They are putting utilities out there and with the intention of grabbing the land and developing it. It will be incremental but I believe that is what is going to happen.

Dave Gibney – In general, I've never heard of any discussion that reaches past Sunshine Road. Someday, Hawkins area is going to incorporate as East Moscow.

Lisa Carloye – That is why I think it is important. If the County values aesthetics and green spaces and in keeping, providing that separation between the two cities, it would be nice to have something in the comp plan that at least states that value. I think you are right. That has been my worry and it is incremental and it does encourage it. I've lived in cities, Champagne, Urbana, Illinois, they are one thing

and you lose a lot when you merge two cities that are separate in all kinds of jurisdictional ways. You lose your character and your identity of who you are.

Alan Thomson – Okay, we have it noted and we will have further discussions on this. thanks.

Chad Whetzel –Before we move on, **Policy 10.1** at the bottom in red, it says, “...and Fiber on the Home (FTTH) projects.” Shouldn’t that be, “Fiber **to** the Home...?”

Dave Gibney – Yes.

Keith Paulson – I have a comment on that fiber, too. Where they are putting fiber in to the small towns, I have fiber running right in front of my house and they won’t allow me to hook up to it. What’s up with that?

Brian Davies – Its dark fiber. There’s nothing in there yet and then you will be approached by a carrier that will want to hook it into your house for service.

Keith Paulson – This went from St. John to the Port of Whitman so the fiber cable is there. That was 15 years ago.

Dave Gibney – Its not you that aren’t allowing to hook up to it. There’s not an ISP permitted to use it to serve you.

Brian Davies – It’s a little different in Colton and Uniontown. We have a franchise agreement with a telephone provider that has been that way for 50 years so they are going to provide that network.

Dave Gibney – The Port is not allowed to be an ISP and that is the issue.

Matt Webb – That’s like having a freeway with no on-ramp.

Brian Davies – The Port can own the infrastructure. They just can’t operate it. They can rent it out and that’s what they are looking for. Someone they can sell that space to and an ISP to provide the service to you Keith, at your home.

Keith Paulson – No one has explained that to me so,

Dave Gibney – All the communication that comes into Pullman, the fiber and everything lands 20 yards that way behind my house and I can’t have it yet.

Keith Paulson - Maybe they will someday.

Dave Gibney – I could probably talk somebody into splicing it right up there. That is an expensive line.

Alan Thomson – Okay, are we done for right now?

MOTION by Brian Davies and seconded by Keith Paulson to adjourn. Motion passed.

Adjourned – 9:08 p.m.

Next meeting October 6, 2021 to tackle Chapter 3.