

**WHITMAN COUNTY  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
ZOOM MEETING  
November 3, 2021**

**MEMBERS:**

**Chad Whetzel – Chairman  
Keith Paulson  
Dave Gibney**

**Brian Davies – Vice Chairman  
Weston Kane  
Russel Jamison**

**Staff:** Alan Thomson, WC Planning Director; Grace Di Biase, WC Assistant Planner; Mark Storey, WC Director/ Engineer; Brandon Johnson, Public Works; Elinor Huber, Clerk.

**Others:** Shelly Chambers; Debbie Snell; Karen Hinnenkamp; Ken Duft.

**7:08 p.m.** – Alan Thomson – Back to page 20, we haven't quite come to a conclusion on railways and railbanking with that language. I sent you the comments from the three commissioners and we had conflicting reports there so, I'd like to ask the planning commission which way you are leaning there.

There is the language that Art put in, and either keeping that in there, and then changing it or taking it out.

*Railways and Rail Banking*

*Railroads and the associated railbeds are essential transportation corridors 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, including methods such as railbanking.*

*The Whitman County Comprehensive Plan supports the use of rail banking to preserve currently unused railroad corridors for future use while allowing other uses, including agricultural access 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 railroad corridors.*

Dave Gibney – I personally am happy with all three paragraphs that we have spent a number of minutes on.

Chad Whetzel – So, here is a question, and I don't know if this is the right idea or not, but we have all agreed on something for now. Would it be worth tabling that portion until the end unless someone comes up with another bright idea and we can address all those at the same time so we can keep having progress on this? Or do we need to go back to that tonight for that one thing?

Alan Thomson – That is a good suggestion, if the planning commission agrees with that. Or you can just leave it and let the BOCC deal with it when it gets to them.

Rusty Jamison – I like that idea. If the BOCC are putting in extra language, just leave ours the way it was and let them haggle with it.

Brian Davies – I think what Commissioner Swannack wanted was to get rid of language that we added in there. Three paragraphs if I remember correctly.

Dave Gibney – No, Commissioner Swannack suggested and we added what is basically the first and second paragraphs, and we had the third paragraph before. I believe we all kind of agreed there was a good reason to keep that third paragraph. If I did a straw vote between their emails, I would see a 2-1 vote to remove Commissioner Swannack's in its entirety and yet I see some value in the language, in his language also. We spent hours and hours on this. Let's leave it just as it is. At least for now.

Chad Whetzel – Is there anyone who has a problem with leaving it as it is for now? Hearing no objections I think we should move on. If we want to go back and look at it we can discuss it later.

Brian Davies – I just looked at my email and it was Commissioner Largent's comment about removing some language. We will have a chance to go back over it, or let them hash it out. Commissioner Largent said to remove Commissioner Swannack's language. Let's let them fight it out.

Alan Thomson – So Dave, I have a suggestion. On the version that I sent you all, on the Transportation Chapter, the red that we have already gone over are the changes that you guys made last time, so if we could just go through them briefly to make sure you agree, that that is what we agreed upon, then we will move on to, I think it is page 40 where we left off.

Dave Gibney – Okay, on page 33, there are some additions to the State Routes at the top of the page. Are we okay with those?

*Other State Routes*

*Other two-lane State Routes include 23, 127, **128**, 194, 271, **272** and **272**.*

Mark Storey – Those are highway numbers I took off the map. I was just making sure the list was correct.

Dave Gibney – Okay, we have 272 in here twice.

Alan Thomson – The second 272 is really 27. The "2" is struck out in the red.

Dave Gibney – Okay, under the *Palouse Scenic Byway* we added:

- *County Roads: Scharpenberg and LaCrosse Airport Roads.*

Page 34, we added "**and Columbia Rivers**" operated by the US Army Corp of Engineers (USACE).

Page 36, we are striking "~~Bill Chipman Palouse Trail~~" under the "*Non-Motorized System.*" Shouldn't it be moved to a stand-alone?

Alan Thomson – Stand-alone what?

Dave Gibney – It is still a non-motorized transportation route in the County. It is just not a county park.

Alan Thomson – Well, then it needs to get moved to the appropriate place. It would be under one of the bullets.

- *City of Pullman Pedestrian & Bicycle Circulation Routes*
- *Palouse to Cascades State Park Trail*
- *Columbia Plateau Trail*
- ***Bill Chipman Palouse Trail***

Dave Gibney – Okay, page 39. GISMO stands for GIS-based Mobility.

Chad Whetzel – What does GIS stand for?

Alan Thomson – Geographic Information System.

Chad Whetzel – So, that is probably what it should say.

Dave Gibney – The Geographic Information System should happen first, but it is right here. So do you want the italics?

Chad Whetzel – Did we italic the definition of an acronym anywhere else?

Mark Storey – I think it is intended to be part of that same title, under *Washington State County Transportation Metrics*.

*(GISMO, **standing for GIS-based Mobility**) GISMO operated by the County Road Administration Board (CRAB), is a comprehensive road inventory and management system **based within a Geographic Information System (GIS) framework.** It enhances a county's ability to make quality decisions through consistent, equitable, and defensible geographically– based management plans and operations. The systematic application of sound business logic, embedded in GISMO, ensures accountability in county road departments, and assists counties in improving the predictable movement of goods and people throughout the County and Washington State.*

Dave Gibney – Okay, down below, on page 40, it says, “*The County’s policy, adopted by Whitman County **Board of County Commissioners, entitled Accommodation....***” Do we always spell it out or do you just use BOCC?

Mark Storey – That is what it is.

Dave Gibney – Again, when you go back through this someday, you might say consistently do we say BOCC for most of the Board of County Commissioners or do we spell it out all the time?

Alan Thomson – I think for this document a lot of people would not know what the acronyms mean so we need to spell them out for this plan. I don’t think that needs to be underlined.

Alan Thomson – So, now we just have to read it and see if we agree. I have a comment on the use of the word, “county,” which is a formal title, we should be consistent on having either a capital “C” or no capital “C”. What do you think?

Brian Davies – I think a capital “C” since we are almost always referring to Whitman County.

Alan Thomson – When you are talking about the County, typically that should be capital “C.” We don’t have to correct all that, Dave. I will do that. If you guys agree to that.

Keith Paulson – When we were back at the trails, some of the trails were capital “C” and others weren’t.

Dave Gibney – I mentioned that.

Keith Paulson - Okay.

Alan Thomson – I will go through the document and tidy things up. So Mark, I assume a lot of these are your changes?

Mark Storey – I’ve been through this document twice. Those small ones that you just went through were a second generation. I think some of these original track changes were my suggested edits when we first got this language from the consultants. It needs scrutiny. I have not reviewed it at the same level other than to fix some errors but I think this is where you want to think about goals. Be more critical maybe of the content than necessarily the English. I was just trying to fix the English so it made sense.

Rusty Jamison – The internet is working so I just need you to connect me. Okay, thank you.

Dave Gibney – Can you see my screen, Rusty? Hang up your phone.

Rusty Jamison – Okay. Yes, I can see it.

Dave Gibney – Okay, still on page 40, next column.

**FRAMEWORK GOAL-PROMOTE AND IMPROVE MOBILITY OPTIONS**

*Provide for a safe and reliable transportation network that enables residents, workers, commerce, and tourists to efficiently travel throughout and across **rural** Whitman County **and its communities**. Continue to explore and improve upon a variety of mobility options, **that include, but are not limited to automobiles, public and private, transit, bicycles and pedestrian.***

Alan Thomson – That is the way we have it here.

Dave Gibney – I don’t know exactly what it means, but inside a city we would be talking about complete streets, about now.

Alan Thomson – We don’t do complete streets like cities do.

Mark Storey – So, just for framework on complete streets, I’ve had this in workshop with the BOCC and the reality for the unincorporated parts of the County is we cannot afford to do complete streets out in the County. It would dilute our few dollars that we actually get for rural roads and make them go even less than they do now. That does not mean that we would not consider bike paths and other things in special cases but just not try to do it everywhere we go.

Brian Davies – Can you define complete street?

Mark Storey – A complete street is a federal recommendation that when you do any work to a road you complete it for all forms of transportation, including motorized, non-motorized, pedestrian bicycle, whatever.

Brian Davies – Thank you, I didn't ever know what that really meant.

Mark Storey – Cities love it but it doesn't work in unincorporated rural areas very well. It doesn't mean we won't build a path at some point, it just means we won't commit to do it on every road.

Brian Davies – Could that also mean widening a road and using a painted delineation like they do for a pedestrian lane before the shoulder?

Mark Storey – So, my conversation with the BOCC is simply that instead of tying our hands with what we are going to do or not going to do, we are actually going to use engineering judgment on every scenario. If it makes sense to have a painted delineated area for walking or pedestrian or bicycling, we will do so. What happens is that the Federal Government offers grants that are complete street based to basically get you to do that. But in order to get the grant you have to complete an ordinance that says you will do it on all projects you consider. It is both a carrot and a stick.

Brian Davies – In perpetuity.

Mark Storey – That's correct.

Dave Gibney – I think in the cities sometimes the Feds will help pay for it.

#### Page 41 – **GOAL T-1 -MULTI-MOTAL HIGHWAY AND COUNTY ROAD NETWORK**

Alan Thomson – There are several small changes on this page. Just look through this quickly and if you have questions, let me know.

*Policy T-1.1 –Recognize the needs of all transportation system users in the County, including motor **vehicles**, ~~and~~ freight, bicyclists, pedestrians, and public transportation.*

Alan Thomson – Okay, the next section.

#### **GOAL T-2 MAINTAIN COUNTY ROAD FACILITIES TO ENSURE CONDINUES FUNCTION AND MOBIITY OF GOODS AND SERVICES.**

*Policy T-2.2 – Prioritize cost-effective maintenance and preservation of County **transportation road** facilities (roads, trails, paths, rail corridors, airport, etc.) to ensure long-term span.*

*Policy T-2-3 –Maintain access to all major County road facilities in all weather conditions to ensure emergency service **access**, public transportation **where feasible** and the movement of goods, services and people.*

Alan Thomson – For an example of capitalizing county in policy 2.1, we've got, "...needs of each area of the county..." So that is a proper phrase so the "county" should be capitalized. Then it's got, "...access to county parks..." So if you think that is good, I will correct that and capitalize the "C."

Chad Whetzel – Well, "parks," should be capitalized, too. Then you should probably capitalize "port district."

Alan Thomson – Is everybody okay with 2.2?

*Policy T-2.2 – Prioritize cost-effective maintenance and preservation of County **transportation road** facilities (roads, trails, paths, rail corridors, airport, etc.) to ensure long-term span.*

Chad Whetzel – Mark, we talked about preservation earlier, is that the way you wanted it used?

Mark Storey – Yes, that’s correct. The main thing is that preservation is continued to use when talking about keeping our system whole. It’s not just maintenance because they are two separate things. Thank you.

Alan Thomson – Is everyone okay with 2.3?

*Policy T-2.3 –Maintain access to all major County road facilities in all weather conditions to ensure emergency service **access**, public transportation **where feasible** and the movement of goods, services and people.*

Dave Gibney – Is that the roads you close or not going to take care of when they get muddy. Is that right, Mark?

Mark Storey – So “Maintain access to all major County road facilities....” So, they are talking about facilities, I presume,

Dave Gibney – That’s your gravel pits and equipment sheds.

Mark Storey – There are seven shops, twenty quarries, all kinds of other bits and pieces around and about that we use to help maintain the system. That is how I read this.

Chad Whetzel – The way that I took the intent originally was basically making sure that whether snow or whatever that emergency vehicles can get through to the houses.

Dave Gibney – Did we add facilities? Is that something we just added?

Alan Thomson – No, that was something that was in there originally. We added “access” and “where feasible.”

Mark Storey – I think that is to make sure we have access to our resources to be able to maintain the transportation system. Not so much access to an individual house but access to our ability to get to our resources.

Alan Thomson – It does mention road facilities. It doesn’t mention residences. It is specific to county road facilities which would be shops and other things like that.

Mark Storey – Shops or state highways.

Chad Whetzel – The reason I was thinking more about homes is because we were talking about emergency services.

Mark Storey – Access to the facilities, that allows us to get a snow plow out to the individual houses. Which then keys into emergency services. That is how I take it. But, if you guys want to clarify that I am fine with that, too.

Chad Whetzel – It seems a little ambiguous one way or another. We need to clean it up. I understand the idea of doing our best to make sure things are open so you guys can do that but there has been times in the past when that didn't happen.

Mark Storey – I would put a period after the word, "conditions," and not even say the rest of it.

Chad Whetzel – Even at that it implies that you would always have access to the facilities. But snow, mud slides, whatever there are all kinds of things that can shut that down.

Mark Storey – This is a goal. It is not a guarantee.

Alan Thomson – Right, it is not something that thou shalt do under any circumstances. This is something like Mark said, is a goal. It is not a development regulation.

Mark Storey – If you want to tell me I can get to your house 365 days a year in all weather conditions, I'd say you are going to have to spend a lot more money than you do now.

Chad Whetzel – That is why I wanted to make sure that people didn't read that and get the wrong idea that you are going to guarantee that they can get some place all the time.

Mark Storey – That's why I said get rid of the second half of the sentence and I think it is way clearer.

*Policy T-2.3 – Maintain access to all major County road facilities in all weather conditions, to ensure emergency service ~~access~~, public transportation ~~where feasible~~ and the movement of goods, services and people.*

Weston Kane – I agree.

Rusty Jamison – I'm for that.

Mark Storey – I finally said something right, today.

Chad Whetzel – Well you can go home now, Mark.

Mark Storey – I am home.

Alan Thomson – Okay, moving along.

**GOAL T-3-PROVIDE SAFE AND ACCESSIBLE NON-MOTORIZED ROUTES SUCH AS BICYCLE PATHS AND TRAILS.**

*Policy T-3.1 – Multimodal facilities should be designed to reduce conflicts and hazards where bicycle, equestrian, and pedestrians use major state and county roadways.*

*Policy T-3.2 – Priority should be given for improvements to routes where significant bicycle and other usage already exist and continue to exist. Support and encourage construction and /or non-motorized paths between communities and economic centers to provide alternative transportation routes.*

*Policy T-3.3 – Designs for road improvements shall be evaluated for their ability to decrease conflicts between all transportation modes and hazards to travelers.*

Keith Paulson – So, is this the first time we have really talked about having horses on some of these trails?

Alan Thomson – I think it has been mentioned before, that we’re not restricting it to any particular type of uses and equestrian has been, I don’t remember the word equestrian has been used but it should be.

Dave Gibney – The question I have is, couldn’t this actually be four policies? These two are related but not exactly the same. I think that those two sentences deserve separate policies. Policy T-3.2 is what I was suggesting to split.

*Policy T-3.2 – Priority should be given for improvements to routes where significant bicycle and other usage already exist and continue to exist. Support and encourage construction ~~and/or~~ of non-motorized paths between communities and economic centers to provide alternative transportation routes.*

Chad Whetzel – That sentence needs to be changed anyway.

Rusty Jamison – I’m fine with that because it doesn’t change the meaning of it.

Brian Davies – One is talking about “existing” and one is talking about “encourage construction for future use.” Maybe two policies is right.

Chad Whetzel – We need to work on that second sentence.

Weston Kane – Do we take out the “and/or” and make it read, “Support and encourage construction for non-motorized paths...”

Chad Whetzel – “**Of** non-motorized paths” would be more correct.

Keith Paulson – That looks better.

Chad Whetzel – I’m good with it.

Page 42 – **GOAL T-4 – DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN A MULTI-MODAL REGIONAL FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM TO SERVE AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL USES IN THE COUNTY**

*Policy T-4.1 – Encourage and support **freight-friendly transportation modes such as rail or barge systems wherever possible. Encourage businesses that generate a significant amount of freight to locate near railroad lines or barge transportation services.***

Policy T-4.2 – Develop an identification and inventory system to **periodically collect evaluate** and analyze ~~truck~~ traffic data **on County roads. Use data to** identify roadway condition deterioration rates and locations caused from **light and heavy vehicle traffic.** This system should be incorporated into **budgetary** and roadway improvement programs to assist in prioritizing ~~construction~~ **capital improvement projects and programs.**

Mark Storey – We are already doing 4.2.

Alan Thomson – Is everybody okay with 4.2 with the corrections? Okay.

*Policy T-4.3 – Through education, public involvement, law enforcement and signage, **encourage the consolidation of** heavy vehicle traffic onto designated ~~H~~ haul ~~R~~ routes.*

Mark Storey – We try to do 4.3 but it is challenging.

*Policy T-4.4 – Use designated H haul Routes to develop priorities for road improvements that are financially feasible and cost effective. Whitman County will endeavor, when feasible, to design, construct and maintain these routes to handle heavy truck traffic.*

Dave Gibney – I suppose somewhere “designated haul” is defined?

Chad Whetzel – Most of all the signs on the highway say “truck route.”

Dave Gibney – Is it defined somewhere in this document?

Mark Storey – No. Which means it should not be capitalized since it is not really a definition. It is a characterization more than a definition. Although you say the same thing in 4.4.

Alan Thomson – I don’t think that should be capitalized.

Mark Storey – I think that would solve it if it wasn’t capitalized.

*Policy T-4.5 - Emphasize and implement **minimum design and construction** standards for all-season **access and public internal** roads ~~to access~~ in industrial and commercial areas on designated **Freights and Goods Transportation System (FGTS)** and haul routes.*

Alan Thomson – Is everybody good with 4.5?

Chad Whetzel – It says something about “...designated **Freights and Good Transportation System**...”

Mark Storey – That is a defined system.

Chad Whetzel – It is “**Good**” and not “**Goods**?”

Mark Storey – Actually it should be “.....**Freight and Goods**.”

Chad Whetzel – Okay.

#### **GOAL T-5 – MAINTAIN A SAFE PULLMAN-MOSCOW HIGHWAY (SR270) CORRIDOR**

*Policy T-5.1 – Promote safe traffic conditions along the Pullman-Moscow Highway (SR 270) between Pullman and the Idaho state line.*

*Policy T-5.2 – Coordinate with County Engineer, Parks Director, Planning staff and other agencies, organizations and interested parties in reviewing capacity and safety needs and improvements along the corridor as development continues.*

*Policy T-5.3 – **Review and modify** development standards, as necessary, to minimize and/or prevent increased access directly to and from SR 270 **from individual properties**. Where appropriate, consider access points to the highway, such as frontage roads.*

Alan Thomson – Are you okay with 5.1?

Chad Whetzel – Do we talk about other state highways besides 270?

Alan Thomson – That would be in this section and I don’t think so.

Chad Whetzel – Why are we singling out one highway?

Rusty Jamison – That is what I was wondering.

Alan Thomson – SR 270 is the only designated zoning area for transportation and economic development. That's why.

Dave Gibney – You have the North and South Corridor Districts.

Alan Thomson – Zoning districts, and in the current comp plan it is designated as a transportation route and economic development and that is the only place in WC that we can do that.

Chad Whetzel – Okay, I'm not going to disagree with that but we should probably have something in there that explains that. Otherwise you are going to have people saying the students use SR 26. Why aren't we concerned with SR 26?

Alan Thomson – Okay, do you have any suggested language, Chad?

Chad Whetzel – Not particularly yet, but I don't even know where it would be appropriate to put that in. Maybe in the subtitle underneath the "Maintain a safe Pullman-Moscow Corridor."

Mark Storey – The difference between a state highway and a county road is the state highways are generally for transportation between destinations, whereas a county road is more generally used for local property access. What is a little bit different about SR 270 is the fact that it is designated for local access off of a state highway for multiple businesses.

So I think it certainly requires a special call-out but I think there should be another large scale goal for the rest of the state highways talking about maintaining safe conditions through coordination with DOT for access control and speed limits, assessments or something like that. This document pertains to land use, not to managing a highway system. Keeping those two things in mind might help you figure out what it is you want to say.

Rusty Jamison – I like the explanation you used with the corridor for the 5.1. That helped me as a person not really knowing the highways why you are treating that one differently than the others. You might explain too, what the corridor means as far as business development.

Chad Whetzel – Maybe just before Policy T-5.1 you can have an explanation and then SR 270 is the only spot where we have the state highway and access to businesses and the corridor and as being such needs special consideration, and then go into your Policies.

Mark Storey – You know just listening to the conversation really the part before the goals should set the goals up so they are self-explanatory. Right? So maybe we need another paragraph or something back in the early part of the chapter that sets it up a little bit. In the Goals you should have all the information and the tips already.

Dave Gibney – You're right. There should be something up here in the Framework that describes the corridor.

Mark Storey – Yes.

Alan Thomson – Okay, I have a suggestion. There is language in the current comp plan that the BOCC put in there, why and how we are treating SR 270 differently. So, I will go in and look at that language and come up with a suggestion.

Dave Gibney – You do have here on page 32, we have some discussion on SR 270. At this point or somewhere else nearby you can get that language.

Alan Thomson – There is a major commercial and commuting route. So, it is getting to the point right there that this is a commercial corridor and maybe we can add in there that this is the only area in the County that is designated this way.

Mark Storey – That is a good point. Maybe just another sentence or two in that section about SR 270, because the rest of it is kind of bare.

Alan Thomson – I can work on that one and bring it to you next time.

Dave Gibney – The other question that I have is you've got T-5 for the corridor, should you have some other language about working with the state and feds on the rest of the roads, the state highways in the County? You are interested in keeping them safe too. Should there be another goal here that talks about the rest of the highways in the County?

Mark Storey – Why don't we take the Goal T-5 and instead of making it just about SR 270, make it about safety of state highways, under which three of four sub-goals have to do with SR 270 and then another sub-goal might have something to do with the rest of the highways.

Dave Gibney – Sounds like you two have work to do for the next meeting.

Alan Thomson – Dave, go back to page 40. On the **Framework Goal – Promote and improve mobility options**. The first sentence there. *“Provide for a safe and reliable transportation network that enables residents, workers, commerce, and tourists to efficiently travel throughout and across rural Whitman County and its communities.”*

Dave Gibney – This is a framework goal that is not a goal in policies.

Alan Thomson – No, but we have mentioned that we want to have a safe transportation network and now we are calling out SR 270 because it is different from all the other transportation networks.

Chad Whetzel – But that is also a state highway and we don't have a lot of say in what they do. That is the State's responsibility.

Rusty Jamison – I kind of like what Mark was saying.

Chad Whetzel – The only thing that I don't like about that is the goal itself, *“Maintain a safe Pullman-Moscow Highway (SR 270) Corridor.”* That title will have to change. Do we do something where we have the Goal T-5 and talk about highways and do like T-5-1.1 and talk about SR 270 and then at the end get down to 5.2 where we talk about all the highways.

Mark Storey – I know I'm not on the planning commission but maybe Alan and I should wrestle with this and bring it back to you. You may love it or you may hate it.

Chad Whetzel – We'll let you know, Mark.

Dave Gibney – I like the idea. We will see about the result later. Moving on, page 42.

**GOAL T-6- ENCOURAGE LAND USE TYPES, MIXES, AND DENSITIES THAT PROMOTE EFFICIENT MULTI-MOTAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.**

*Policy T-6.1 –Encourage efficient and orderly development of **properties and utilities** by identifying and evaluating properties that are conducive to mutual planning through reciprocal cooperative agreements. This includes those area around Pullman that are identified as residential cluster areas **and the Pullman Tax Sharing Agreement.***

Dave Gibney – We have a comment from Debbie that the Tax Sharing Agreement is presumably described somewhere else in here and Matt says, no. Have we fixed that?

Alan Thomson – Well, Matt was wrong. It is on page 18. It is mentioned and it is further described on page 60 under Economic Development. So, what is said on page 18 it talks about the tax sharing agreement. It also says in brackets, “See page 60 for a definition of tax sharing area.”

Dave Gibney – Okay, I can delete both comments. Page 43.

*Policy T-6-2 – Encourage development that is consistent with the Land Use Element which reduces conflicts, minimizes the need for expansion of the County’s road system and maintains the same level of service for road **facilities.***

Dave Gibney – We have another comment from Debbie on 6.2, that says, “growth on one hand and reluctance to increase services for potential economic expansion?” Matt doesn’t necessarily agree with her.

Alan Thomson – When I read that, I agree with Matt. What do you all think?

Dave Gibney – If we didn’t increase economics without adding new roads that is probably better than adding new roads, too.

Alan Thomson – I think you can have both. You just have to carefully plan it. That is what is intended there.

Debbie Snell – I just didn’t want to have it a shut door.

Alan Thomson – No, there is no shut door. We just want to expand to be safe.

Dave Gibney – It kind of says, if someone came to us with a proposal to do “X” and the alternative for “X” included more county roads or an alternative for “X” included to do it with the existing road, we would prefer they do it with the existing road.

Alan Thomson – I think if you asked Mark if he wanted to expand the County road system,

Dave Gibney – No, we wouldn’t discourage “X.”

Mark Storey – The answer is if it can be safely done without expanding the existing road system, why go to that trouble and expense when you can already accommodate it? If it cannot be done in a safe and reasonable fashion then the County road system should be expanded. That is how I read it.

Debbie Snell – I’m good with it.

*Policy T-6.3 –Review all proposed land use development **proposals** for consistency with the transportation system. Encourage placement of residential, commercial, and industrial uses in areas with existing access to appropriate infrastructure to support such uses.*

Dave Gibney - Are we good with T-6.1, 2, and 3? (Everyone says it’s good.)

Moving on to T-7. I don’t suppose there has been any contact from the city about further progress on the Airport overlay zoning?

Alan Thomson – You would be correct. No further progress.

**GOAL T-7 – PROTECT AND SUPPORT EXISTING AIR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES IN WHITMAN COUNTY**

*Policy T-7.1-Existing airports, specifically **the** Port of Whitman Business Air Center and **the** Pullman-Moscow Regional Airport, shall be protected from encroachment by incompatible **land uses and** developments. ~~In order to ensure this~~ **facilitating orderly and compatible development**, encourage the development of long-range master plans for airport facilities and implementation of the Airport Landing Zone Overlay District (ALO).*

Dave Gibney – I guess the Feds are currently happy with what we have been doing so they haven’t been pushing that either.

Alan Thomson – We have not had any kind of development proposals that would be a conflict there.

Chad Whetzel – Is it the Pullman-Moscow Airport or the Moscow-Pullman Airport?

Alan Thomson – the Pullman–Moscow Airport.

Mark Storey – It depends on which side of the line you live on. It is the Pullman-Moscow Airport. Pullman owns the airport.

*Policy T-7.2 – Sites for new airstrips and airports shall be evaluated for safety and impacts on existing land uses as defined in the development standards section of the Zoning Ordinance.*

*Policy T-7.3 – Commercial and industrial uses near or adjacent to adjacent to airport facilities should **be considered compatible if they do not** conflict with aircraft operations.*

Alan Thomson - Is everybody okay with Policy T-7.1, 2, 3? Okay, next one.

**GOAL T-8-SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO POPULATIONS IN NEED**

*Policy T-8.1 – Support organizations and programs (i.e., COAST) which provide transportation options for groups in Whitman County, such as the elderly, who may not have the same access to transportation as the general population.*

*Policy T-8.2 – Collaborate with other rural counties, cities, towns and the States of Idaho **and Washington** to seek and develop **common** solutions to the transportation needs of the **region’s** elderly and disabled.*

Alan Thomson – Okay, what about T-8.1, and .2? (Everyone said okay.)

**GOAL T-9 – PARTICIPATE IN STATE AND REGIONAL PLANNING FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITY NEEDS AND FUNDING WITHIN WHITMAN COUNTY.**

*Policy T-9.1 – State highway planning should reflect the priorities and constraints identified in local planning and public works programming. Primary state highways running through Whitman county (i.e., SR 26, SR 270, US 195) should remain top funding priorities for safety and mobility improvements.*

*Policy T-9.2 – Continue active coordination and communications with State transportation and local agencies including: WSDOT, Whitman County Public Works Department, Port of Whitman County, unincorporated rural communities, incorporated cities and towns, adjacent counties, towns, cities, state agencies and Washington State University.*

Page 44:

*Policy T-9.3 – Where appropriate, collaborate with **the** Palouse Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO) to help promote and improve local and regional, transportation **planning** needs and projects in Whitman County.*

Dave Gibney – Mark, do you want to talk about the Palouse Regional Transportation Planning Organization?

Mark Storey – Are you going to make me? I have some definite opinions about it. My biggest goal with them is to make sure that nobody puts something in a plan that says that we are beholden to them rather than the other way around. I know the BOCC will not go for that.

Dave Gibney – I just noticed that you were repeating some of the state highways in 9.1. Should we fill that out like we did up above?

Brian Davies – And we have US 195 in T-9.1? That is not correct. It is SR 195, correct, Mark?

Mark Storey – I would need to check that. I thought it was US 195.

**Page 48 – PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS ELEMENT (third paragraph) Purpose**

*In addition to the management and preservation of Whitman County’s parks and recreation facilities, there **are many** historic and culturally important sites, buildings and scenic drives throughout the county that are important to preserve and protect.*

*As mentioned in the previous section, parks and recreation is a key component to enhancing **regional and local** quality of life. According to the county’s Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan, approximately 95% of the land within Whitman County is in private ownership.*

Chad Whetzel – In that first paragraph, the word “are” is left out.

Dave Gibney – I think the word “many” should be in there instead of “number.”

Chad Whetzel – Then it gets redundant a couple lines down. “...throughout the county that of significant importance for preservation and protection. We’ve already talked about the significance and importance so I don’t know that we need to have that in there twice.

Dave Gibney – I suppose the 95% in private ownership is still a valid number?

Alan Thomson – Yes, I had David Mahan from the Parks Department look through this. Hopefully he is correct.

Page 49

Dave Gibney – We have a list here and maps and there are four county parks in this table.

Alan Thomson – Unless we know of others.

Keith Paulson – Is Steptoe Butte listed on anything?

Alan Thomson - You mean as far as a park is concerned?

Keith Paulson – Well, there really isn’t a park.

Page 50.

Alan Thomson – There is but it is State park at the top. Are you okay with this page? Okay, someone has beamed in some editing. I don’t know who that was if it was Dave Mahan, or Mark, did you do any editing here?

Mark Storey – I did not do any editing to that section.

Alan Thomson – I might have been Dave Mahan, then.

Dave Gibney – There is a bunch of new stuff here.

Debbie Snell – Did you pick up my comment on the Snake River Trail at Boyer?

Alan Thomson – I don’t know if we are there yet.

Debbie Snell – Are we on other Parks and Trails in Whitman County?

Dave Gibney – I don’t see any comment by you.

Debbie Snell – I’ve got one on my copy. If you guys would be agreeable, under Other Parks and Trails in WC, could you adjacent to the Boyer Park entry, add the “Snake River Trail at Boyer Park and Marina?”

Alan Thomson – It is in there.

Debbie Snell – Okay, there it is. Someone added it. Great.

Dave Gibney – The word, “trail,” isn’t here.

Debbie Snell – If you would add “trail,” thank you.

Alan Thomson – Are we good with page 50, now? Okay, let's move on.

Chad Whetzel – So, on the Snake River there is no distance listed.

Debbie Snell – I'll have to find out and get back to you.

Dave Gibney – Okay, let's move on to Historic Sites, page 51.

Chad Whetzel – The *Manning Bridge* is gone.

David Gibney – I will strike it out. How do you inform the National Register that it burned down? And who would do that?

Alan Thomson – All kinds of agencies were aware of this. DNR may be the ones who did that. I don't if they did or not.

David Gibney – I'm under the assumption that it was.

Mark Storey – There is a State agency called the Department of Historic Preservation, DAHP, Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation that tracks those kinds of things. I'm not sure how they would get notified on a private bridge other than just say that it burned down. I know DNR was part of the process to find funding to pull it out of the river. DNR actually has jurisdiction over the bed of the river at that location. So, they are aware at DNR.

Alan Thomson – They are and they also controlling the new bridge that is going in, too.

Dave Gibney – Do you want me to delete it?

Alan Thomson – For our purposes, yes, because it no longer is there.

Rusty Jamison – I have a question. What is the "*Grain Co. Elevator and Flathouse*?"

Alan Thomson – I don't know about that. It might be something the consultant came across.

Dave Gibney – Before final adoption you might want to check with the National and State registry to see if this date has changed before the draft.

Alan Thomson – *The First Baptist Church* at Hay is that still there? I don't know.

Keith Paulson – There is a church at Hay because I had a niece that got married there last week-end. I can't tell you if it was First Baptist or some other denomination.

Alan Thomson – Who was *Henry Hart Spalding*?

Dave Gibney – Maybe he was a historic family in the general area.

Alan Thomson – Did you see the note from Debbie that the Snake River Trail is 3.5 miles?

Dave Gibney – I don't know if I want to go back up there to fix it.

Alan Thomson - It is only up above.

Debbie Snell – I'm sorry, Dave.

Dave Gibney – It’s okay, it’s getting late. I even forgot I was supposed to be here. How about the narrative over here?

### *Challenges*

*Limited space available within Whitman County for Dispersed Recreation – As noted in the Parks Comprehensive Plan, approximately 95% of land within Whitman County is privately owned. With a lack of available acreage this severely limits the amount of open space and land available to County residents to enjoy dispersed recreational opportunities.*

Keith Paulson – When you have open space does that mean people can go on that land?

Brian Davies – No, because space is just a property tax designation. It doesn’t mean that people can trespass on your property.

Keith Paulson – I didn’t think so but it says, “*With a lack of available acreage, this severely limits the amount of open space and land available to County residents to enjoy dispersed recreational opportunities.*”

Brian Davies – Maybe we should get rid of open space and, we don’t have public land in this County. It is privately owned.

Alan Thomson – Public lands in the sense of public park.

Brian Davies – But we don’t have large areas of public areas in the County like some areas do.

Dave Gibney – This is in the *Challenges* so we are not saying that, I don’t think that there is an implication because it is open that people get to trespass.

Brian Davies – No, this is one of the challenges that we are having. The lack of available acreage.

Dave Gibney – Your suggestion is to do this.

Keith Paulson – That reads better.

Chad Whetzel – I like that better.

(Clerk’s note: I don’t know what he did so you have to fix it, Alan!)

Page 52 – Second paragraph

*Variety of recreational programs – Along with local schools, recreational program are available by a number of providers. Many are centralized around the Pullman area. This included City of Pullman, Washington State University and other private organizations and camps. Whitman County Parks and Recreation Department also operates **some** ~~a number of~~ activities. (confirm which, if any?)*

Dave Gibney – “Whitman County Parks and Recreation Department also operates a number of activities.” This yellow highlight I guess is what, what are we talking about there?

Rusty Jamison – Do you operate the swimming pools in the County?

Alan Thomson – What swimming pools in the County? They are all inside incorporated towns in the County.

Mark Storey – I don't know what all might be entailed in that but I do know that the Parks Department runs a rope course for high schools at the Elberton park on a regular basis and they have facilities for that at the Elberton Park. They have activities that reach into the schools with school age kids. That is just an example. I don't know what else is out there.

Chad Whetzel – I would say “some” not “number.” that sounds like it should be greater than ten and so far we only have one.

Dave Gibney – Someone will have to talk to them and get more detail no matter how you look at it

Chad Whetzel – Another good job for Alan. He looks bored.

Alan Thomson – Thanks, Chad.

Mark Storey – I agree to having Alan do more.

Alan Thomson – I don't even know who asked that question? Was that the consultant? This seems like a good spot to stop.

Chad Whetzel – Yes, and we are about to get into rail banking and we know what will happen.

Brian Davies – A good place to stop.

Dave Gibney – Do you want me to just the note that we stopped here?

Alan Thomson – You can stop at Goals on Page 53. There is one thing I wanted to clarify. At the very end of the Land Use element on page 25. This comment about updating the telecommunication regulations. I talked with our guys and as far as they know everything is updated. So I think we can eliminate that comment right there.

Dave Gibney – The whole goal?

Alan Thomson – I don't know if that should be a goal. *“The County should update...”* We have updated it.

Chad Whetzel – We will update it again in the future.

Mark Storey – I would suggest “maintain and update.”

Policy LU-10-1 – *“The County should **maintain** and update its telecommunications regulations to ensure compliance with FCC regulations....”*

Alan Thomson – I talked to the BOCC about this and they weren't keen on the idea. So we made some good progress tonight. Thank you. Two weeks from now since we are on a roll here?

Chad Whetzel – That would be November 17<sup>th</sup>.

Alan Thomson - How does that look for everybody? Okay, I'll send you an email and give you the latest edition of that. Hopefully we can meet in two weeks.

Rusty Jamison – It works really good, Alan, if you get ahold of Sandy, her and I talk all the time so if she says I'm going to be there, then just take that for a "yes" for me.

Alan Thomson – Okay.

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

**Adjourned - 9:01 p.m.**

