

**WHITMAN COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION
Comprehensive Plan Update
Workshop Meeting**

Attending: Mark Storey, WC Director/Engineer; Alan Thomson, WC Planning Director; Grace Di Biase, WC Assistant Planning Director; Todd Hall, LDC; Art Swannack, WC Commissioner; Tom Handy, WC Commissioner; Dave Gibney, PC Member; Weston Kane, PC Member; Shelly Gibson; Alexandria Osborne; Elinor Huber, Clerk.

6:02 p.m. – Alan Thomson – This is not a regular meeting for the Planning Commission so, Todd you have the floor right from the get-go.

Todd Hall – Thank you very much. Tonight we’re picking up where we left off from the last meeting. We are going to be talking about the public facilities and also the parks. I’ll get the power point up on the screen.

Welcome again. I don’t know who is new and I see a couple of folks who have been here on previous meetings so, welcome back. This is just picking up where we left off on our comp plan update. We are doing three virtual meetings through the month of June. We met last time on June 2nd, and now we are picking up with the next comp plan element.

The last time we reviewed the Introduction, the Transportation Elements, and also the Economic Development Element. Thank you all who participated in the last meeting. We also received some input from staff as well as the commissioners. So, this is an on-going process and updating the elements as we are going along. This is another opportunity to engage with the public.

Parks, Trails, and Recreation

Goals and policies supporting the creation a sustainability of parks and their resources

The map on the right identifies all of the parks that are located within Whitman County. Because the vast majority of the lands within the County are productive agriculture land that limits the ability to have recreation amenities comparative to other counties in the State. However, that doesn’t mean that they are any less important to the citizens and folks who come to visit WC.

- *Locate facilities and recreational opportunities to meet the needs of County residents and visitors*
- *Protect open spaces and wildlife areas*
- *Sustainably maintain and operate park system*

That is really important from a budget perspective because we all know that operations, we were talking about that with regards to transportation. That is the same for keeping your parks and facilities well maintained for generations to come.

- *Identify new recreational and trail opportunities*

Mark Storey – There are some things on here, when you look at that map, there are a lot of Army Corps of Engineer Facilities down along the Snake River, none of which are shown. They are all recreational

related and then also there are some other public lands like the Escure Ranch in the far western part of the County that is not shown. Then there are two county parks that are not even on there. So, I'm curious, the data base or criteria for what you are putting on the map and do we need to get you some more information?

Todd Hall – Yes that would be helpful. This is what was our planners were told. I believe it was from mostly the website and possibly the old comp plan. If there are additional resources we need to identify yes, please pass that along and we will get that on there right away.

Mark Storey – Is ownership part of the issue or is it any ownership that is recreational related?

Todd Hall – We identified any kind of facilities that are within the County. That is something that most comp plans will have. Park facilities that aren't just county or city, it will have whatever recreational opportunity.

When it comes to operational things that you have purview over, of course, that will focus on county parks. But for the sake of identification of what is available in the County was our intention to include those other facilities as well. If that is something that the County would like to do we can keep that theme.

Mark Storey – What we need is more information.

Dave Gibney – Is there anything around Rock Lake?

Mark Storey – There is a boat launch at Rock Lake. That is the only public facility. I'm not sure of the ownership of it.

Dave Gibney – It is a body of water that is not noted, also.

Mark Storey – Alan and I will look at this map and give you more information.

Todd Hall – That is really helpful. Again, we are talking about the particular Frameworks slide identified at the last meeting and more in depth each one of these Framework goals and now we haven't them numbered per your recommendations as to not draw importance to any specific one. Like one versus ten, so now we are just keeping them as a general framework goal but we are associating them to their perspective topic area.

Next page. ***Framework Goal – Protection of private property rights.*** *All policies and decisions made by the County, and as guided by the Comprehensive Plan, will strive to protect fundamental property rights of individuals and ensure that Whitman County land use policies and regulations balance the private property rights of all landowners to the degree possible.*

Protection of private property rights is always going to be associated with regards not only to land use but also with parks and trails, because we want to be respectful of the property rights and those that are adjacent to potential facilities. We included that framework goal in this element.

Framework Goal – Support recreation and access to natural areas. *Support county residents in their ability to access outdoor recreation and natural areas throughout Whitman County through*

collaboration and partnerships, while recognizing the need to protect natural, scenic and environmentally sensitive areas.

Framework Goal – Preserve cultural heritage of Whitman County. *Recognize the value and importance of Whitman County’s heritage, protecting important cultural and historical buildings and sites.*

A lot of times park facilities may have special features that draw attention to the history of the County or the community that is located in. That is always tied into parks and recreation.

Next page. **Goal PR-1** – *Provide park, recreation and open space opportunities that meet the needs of Whitman County residents and visitors.*

Again, none of these are in any particular order. The same with the framework goals of either this one or the other. We are just highlighting for each of the elements.

Policy PR-1.1 – *Development of new parks and recreation facilities shall be consistent with the Land Use Element and the Whitman County Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan.*

Policy PR-1.2 – *Maintain and improve existing park, recreation and trail resources that provide recreational opportunities for a wide range of ages and interest groups.*

Policy PR-1.3 – *To ensure the current and long-term recreational needs of county residents, collaborate with other local and regional agencies, citizen groups and volunteers and private sector partners.*

Policy PR-1.4 – *Recognize the value that a well-maintained parks and recreation network provides in attracting economic development and tourism to Whitman County and the Palouse region.*

Todd Hall - I see a chat over here from Art Swannack. I see the one about the Colfax Trails. We did mention it in the text but we didn’t include it on the map.

Alan Thomson – Rock Lake is privately owned. You can actually access the land. You can boat in there. You can get into it so I guess that would be recreational because people can get on to Rock Lake but you can’t actually go on shore. That is private property.

Todd Hall – So, the access is private. Okay, so the people have to ask for permission in order to access or they are getting it from some other location outside the County?

Alan Thomson – I think they are floating upstream to get into the lake.

Art Swannack – No, off of Rock Lake Road, there is a Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife boat launch access just across the bridge at the west end. Everyone goes in at the access point just before you get to the bridge going up headed north on Rock Lake Road. They use that for fishing. Usually someone gets foolish enough to kayak or do something else on that thing.

Alan Thomson – Dan Gladwill wouldn’t be stupid enough to do that, would he?

Art Swannack – I hope not because they have lost several people on that lake. It gets winds on that corridor that just blows it up.

Mark Storey – The answer to Alan’s question is, “yes,” he has many times.

Next page. **Goal PR-2 – Identify, preserve and protect open space recreation and wildlife areas in Whitman County.**

Policy PR-2.1 – Collaborate and support state, federal and other agencies who manage open space areas in Whitman County to ensure these areas are maintained an available to the public.

I think we talked about this before. The word “support” can mean different things. In this case, obviously, it means not financial support but support in terms of collaborating.

Policy PR-2.2 – Where feasible, identify additional opportunities for access to open spaces and wildlife corridors through lawful access of private property, while respecting private property rights and the continuation of agriculture, ranching and other agriculture activities.

This is clearly stating that the desire is to have access to open spaces but it needs to be done in a lawful manner and not trespassing on private property unless somebody gave them a right to do so.

Policy PR-2.3 – Ensure that access to open spaces and wildlife areas is consistent with the protection of environmentally sensitive areas, such as wetlands, streams, steep slopes and other similar areas.

This is a pretty common goal in a lot of comp plans in relationship to parks and recreation elements. Just noting that these are part of the recreation for the enjoyment of passive opportunities. We also want to make sure that these are protected sensitive areas to be preserved.

Alan Thomson – Art just brought up something. There is a Fish & Wildlife parcel of land, I don’t know how many acres, but I think it is up in the Revere area. So, F & W own property up there and it is a habitat area. It might be recreational type.

Todd Hall – If there is an area that is maybe on a map or something that we can identify that would be helpful. We can put that on that main map that I showed earlier.

Alan Thomson – We can look at some of the assessor’s maps and figure out where that F & W property is.

Next page. **Goal- PR-3 - Support the maintenance and operations of the County’s existing trails.**

Policy PR-3.1 – Support ongoing maintenance of the County’s existing trails located within County parks and along existing rail corridors.

Policy PR-3.2 – Work with state and other funding sources to help continue the development of the County’s trail network.

Policy PR-3.3 – Where appropriate, collaborate with community services groups and volunteers to help with maintenance and upkeep of trails.

So, that means there is a pretty dedicated group for not only the promotion of new potential trails, but also the maintenance of existing trails. We just wanted to be able to highlight those and what you have as far as resources now, you want to be able to keep those viable and maintained in the future.

Next page. **Goal PR-4 – Explore opportunities for new trails in Whitman County**

Policy PR-4.1 - *Explore potential options for new trail development and future trail expansion throughout Whitman County.*

Policy PR-4.2 – *Consider rail banking as a viable and legal option to develop multi-purpose trails on currently unused rail corridors.*

So, this takes up the lengthy conversation we had a couple of months ago about the rail banking item. So, we are recognizing that the rail banking option is a viable option and so we wanted to mention that.

Policy PR-4.3 – *Pursue and encourage public involvement in trail planning through a variety of methods, including but not limited to, trail and open space advocacy groups, local city and county advisory groups, and other volunteer organizations.*

We've seen that already in some of the meetings that we have held.

Policy PR-4.4 – *Seek and establish ongoing funding sources for the development of new multi-purpose and specific use trails (i.e., hiking and/or equestrian only.)*

I know that staff is talking internally about making sure that we are capturing the tenure correctly on the rail banking specifically but, of course, these other ones as well.

Alan Thomson – The rail banking needs to go in the transportation element, as well.

Dave Gibney – You could use a little different wording in the transportation element.

Todd Hall – I think the discussion that we had, at least Alan, Mark and I had, was that it is a form of transportation, a non-motorized form. So, noting not only in a trail option but also as a potential, the rails themselves are similar to (inaudible).

Dave Gibney – The main transportation purpose of rail banking is to preserve the railroad right-of-way for a potential future rail.

Todd Hall – That is the Parks and Recreation element so I'm open any additional conversation on that before the next chapter. Is there anything specific in any of these that you want to chat about?

Alan Thomson – The main thing is just to get the map updated and get everything that needs to be there.

Todd Hall – We will take another stab at that and anything you have to provide that would be helpful for cleaning this up.

Dave Gibney – Some of the smaller towns even those that are incorporated have small public areas.

Tom Handy – They are also going to be developing a trailhead in Malden as they rebuild that town. The State Parks is working on that.

Todd Hall – My speaker just cut out for a brief moment. Sorry about that.

Dave Gibney – The trail head would probably be part of that Palouse Cascades in the neighborhood by Malden.

Tom Handy – Yes, it is on that trail. It would be right in the town of Malden.

Dave Gibney – I guess I would encourage you guys to be generous and kind of thorough when you figure out what to put on that map.

Alan Thomson – Dave, to that point, since this is the comp plan for the unincorporated area of WC, the towns that are incorporated, we are not going to include them, I would presume, if they are incorporated.

Todd Hall – If we identified Pullman we are going to have quite a few there, and Colfax, right?

Dave Gibney – Are there any unincorporated towns that have open space available to the public?

Mark Storey – Not to my knowledge.

Alan Thomson – I can't think of any right now but we could give that one some thought.

Mark Storey – I don't know if any specifically in the unincorporated towns. But going back to this map again, I think the goal is to show the whole facility rather than focus on the individual trail heads or features. We should try to get which facilities are available for recreation or parks or whatnot. I agree with Alan. I think that it is the unincorporated areas, because this map will become way too complicated if we try to capture other jurisdictions.

Tom Handy – It will get busy real fast.

Todd Hall – I know that Lyons Ferry and Palouse Falls kind of straddle two counties. I would say that you consider those as part of your shared recreational facility, I guess.

Alan Thomson – Say yes on that one.

Todd Hall – But the entirety of the others on the Snake are within Whitman County?

Alan Thomson - Along the Snake River there, all along the river are areas owned by the Corps that people recreate on. I don't know, Mark, can you specifically identify any area there? How would you do that?

Mark Storey - I think from Wawawai Park to Clarkston the whole thing is a recreational zone, managed by the Army Corps. Then downstream of that you already have Boyer. I don't know if there is still open land at Central Ferry or not. That is the only one that is not reflected here. Right to the Idaho State line should be considered a recreational corridor.

Todd Hall – That’s because it has a boating influence between the dams?

Mark Storey – It has boat launches, and public land along the whole thing where people go fishing and recreate in all different kinds of ways.

Todd Hall – We could identify that as a recreational corridor or whatever you prefer on naming that. You could talk that over and let us know. That is certainly doable.

Alan Thomson – It is all Army Corps land so Army Corps Recreational Areas, I don’t know.

Art Swannack – Boyer and Wawawai are actually Army Corps land that we have contracted on Wawawai for years. Boyer is contracted through the Port of Whitman versus Whitman County.

Alan Thomson – Let’s give that one some thought, Todd.

Todd Hall – Anything else on parks?

Next page – **Public Services, Facilities and Utilities - Goals and policies identifying and supporting the development and improvement of services, facilities and utilities.**

- *Locate services, facilities and utilities to meet the needs of County today and in the future*
- *Consider siting of public facilities and their impacts on land use, especially agricultural lands*

Todd Hall – This one is kind of a two-faceted thing because especially like referring to the picture there of the wind turbines. That is going to be captured in the next segment. That map is going to be leading in two weeks which is the land use and the environmental section. This speaks to that because it is a sustainable type of production for energy. But we are also talking about it from a fighting perspective on how much impact it has on the land where it is placed, versus say in other locations throughout the State or in the Country, solar is used. But I would say that that is going to have a much greater impact in areas such as WC. Just some food for thought on that.

Next Page – **Framework Goal – Protection of private property rights**

All policies and decisions made by the County, and as guided by the Comprehensive Plan, will strive to protect fundamental property rights of individuals and ensure that Whitman County land use policies and regulations balance the private property rights of all landowners to the degree possible.

Framework Goal – Enhance countywide services

Through innovative approaches, interagency coordination and responsible fiscal policy, provide for effective, supportive, and well-planned services to residents across the county.

Framework Goal –Effective Land Use Planning

Develop countywide goals and policies that promote effective and consistent land use decisions that are responsive to local growth but also protect the unique character of Whitman County.

Art Swannack - Your comment about solar. What did you mean by that?

Todd Hall – Not to discount it but it is really just getting at the impact of the land impact that it would have on the overall square footage. Solar is a great opportunity to provide a way to capture for public facilities for electricity, but just a consideration, at what cost do you want to do that on the impacts to land that are placed on productive land, your agriculture? That’s all I really meant by it. It wasn’t to discount it by any means, but it does take up greater footprint area, say versus wind turbine which is just placed in one spot.

Art Swannack – I understand that. I was just thinking more that solar has a bigger impact in the picture you have than wind. But if you go into areas that are lower in production, such as pasture land, that area would not, in terms of the production value versus the income generated.

Alan Thomson – Wouldn’t that get down to the choice of the landowners? If they want to give up farm land, that would be their choice.

Art Swannack – In the end, it becomes the landowner’s choice versus how much the neighbors are willing to put up with, too. Then whatever environmental impacts, you have different things with solar and wind with the impacts to the environment.

Todd Hall - We talked a little bit about that last time about the potential impacts to the wind turbines and the view sheds and how they are placed. I would imagine that solar has some impacts too, in terms of glare and the angle of the sun and hitting adjacent properties. I know that first hand being from the southwest, I’ve seen that depending on what time of day it is, you are going to get a bright light shining right at your front door. That is, again it is up to the County and the property owners, I guess in terms of how you want to approach this.

Art Swannack – Alan, is there anything from the State with this push towards electric cars, electric everything else that would push us to accept more renewables in our comp plan or in our county code than what we currently do?

Alan Thomson – The only thing I can think of that comes from the State would be the EFSEC process. That is renewable energies that the State has determined is of high importance. If the local jurisdiction does not have for instance, development regulations for wind farms or solar farms, the State can pull this EFSEC thing and basically push us aside and go ahead and sign it.

That is why we have a wind turbine ordinance because we heard about EFSEC before we had the wind farm up there. We wanted to avoid that so we put the ordinance in place so that there was no need for the State to intervene. So, the applicants are the ones that would push for an EFSEC process if we didn’t have a code that would deal with this.

The comp plan needs to mention renewable energy. We don’t have to get into detail in there it just needs to allow the possibility of renewable energy projects. Then the development regulations need to address that.

Art Swannack – Do we address solar in our development regulations?

Alan Thomson – We have not.

Next Page – **Goal PF-1 – Site public facilities and utilities consistent with the policies of the land use element.**

Todd Hall – We just want to make sure what choices are made here are also compatible and consistent with the other elements.

Policy PF-1.1 – All major public facilities construction, whether by state/federal government agencies or public utilities, should serve needs which are consistent with the environmental, social, and economic characteristics of the region, small towns and family farms.

Next page. **Goal- PF-2 – Ensure that public services, facilities and utilities are adequate to support existing and future development throughout Whitman County.**

Policy PF-2.1 - Prior to approval of any land development, verify that adequate public facilities and utilities are available.

Policy PF-2.2 – Collaborate with City of Pullman to promote the extension of urban infrastructure and services to commercial and industrial lands within the Pullman Urban Growth Area.

Policy PF-2.3 – Whitman County should promote effective and ongoing collaboration and communicate between incorporated towns and other agencies to improve public services, facilities and utility services.

Policy PF-2.4 – Coordinate long-range planning efforts with both public and private service providers to ensure sufficient infrastructure capacity for future needs.

Art Swannack – Is Broadband or that type of thing included in this?

Todd Hall – Yes that would be included. I think I mentioned that in future ones, here.

Dave Gibney – Where do we talk about the right-of-way of utilities, gas and fiber and such? Or do we?

Todd Hall – Here we are talking about the minimization of impacts and airport and adjacent land use. There may not be one specifically on right-of-way but that is something we can add. There is one on the telecommunications.

Mark Storey – The State law already has some language that pertains to public right-of-way and we are compelled to try and accommodate utilities within public right-of-ways throughout the County. I don't care if we mention it but state law already pretty much assures that we have to do that, whether we like it or not. I would leave that for an open discussion point.

Todd Hall – If that is the case then there probably isn't much needed to focus on it.

Alan Thomson – If a utility needs to have a right-of-way, they go through a process of negotiating with the landowners. We, the County don't intervene with that between the landowners and the public services and they get a lease through that private land for all these corridors.

Mark Storey – That is true on private land. I’m just talking for the public rights-of-way that we are compelled to try and accommodate them.

Alan Thomson – I have an observation and a question query. The heading, “Public Services, Facilities and Utilities.” When I read that, the word “public” means public facility, not a private facility. That is the understanding I have there. Then you show photos of the wind farm, which is a private corporation. There seems to be a little confusion there.

Todd Hall – We could change it to just “Facilities and Utilities.”

Alan Thomson – Yes, because if we do get another wind farm application, it is a private company that develops it, not a public company.

Mark Storey – I think both are correct. The wind farm is considered a public utility because they sell their services to the public.

Alan Thomson – Right, so that heading there needs to be changed.

Mark Storey – Yes, that would clear it up a little bit.

Dave Gibney – Your landfill facility is a public facility. It is private here.

Mark Storey – We can look at that language a little bit and see if we can get it a little bit more clear.

Todd Hall – That is the current title but we are open to change in that.

Alan Thomson – I was just wondering if someone was to argue that the wind farm is not a public service.

Art Swannack – Just get rid of the word, “Public” and make it “Services.”

Todd Hall – Most comp plans that I’ve done are city ones and they just call them, “Capital Facilities Element.”

Art Swannack – That is because they run it.

Todd Hall – Exactly. That is a little different here. We can just remove, “Public.”

Alan Thomson – I think that would be a good solution.

Next page. **Goal PF-3 – Construction of major facilities initiated by state or federal government should be designed to minimize irreversible use of agricultural lands, and to minimize impacts on farm and ranch operations.**

Policy PF-3.1 – Monitor plans and proposals of state and federal agencies for potential impacts to property.

Policy PF-3.2 – Utilize A-95 project funding review process to ensure that County policies are considered in the funding of state and federal projects and programs.

Policy PF-3.3 – Consider a permitting process for the siting of essential public facilities within Whitman County.

Todd Hall – I think a couple of these may be, correct me if I am wrong, but maybe some leftovers from the old comp plan. I'm not sure if you still want to keep these. In your first assessment that seemed to be the case so we showed those.

Alan Thomson – I think that this has to have a broader conversation. There is wording in the current comp plan that I don't think fits right now. It is contradictory to what we are doing, as well with the development regulations. You'll see that a little further along in your slide show that there is some wording in here that I think is problematic.

Dave Gibney – Are you going to define A-95?

Todd Hall – Yes.

Next page. **Policy PF-3.4** – Discourage the siting of public facilities that do not require public services or utilities in agricultural areas of the County.

Policy PF-3.5 – Development proposals for cellular towers or other telecommunications facilities shall not be allowed if they pose unmitigated hazards for the safe operations and use of airport facilities within the County.

Alan Thomson - Help me understand what 3.4 means? I'm not sure I understand what that statement says.

Todd Hall – I think what I was getting at was, again this gets back to the “Public” wording. Facilities that don't require utility hook ups or power in Ag areas that would be isolated areas. I think that was the intent of that one.

Alan Thomson – What would that public facility be? Can you think of an example?

Art Swannack – How about a boat launch?

Todd Hall - Some kind of an observatory in the middle of nowhere with solar power.

Alan Thomson – Do we want to discourage that?

Dave Gibney – Yes, why do you want to discourage this stuff?

Alan Thomson – Is this part of our current comp plan?

Todd Hall – It may be. I'll have to double check and see what that one is. It may be a left over.

Alan Thomson – I think it is. This is language that I don't think fits anymore. Unless you can tell me what public facility that we want to discourage would be.

Dave Gibney – It seems like you would want to encourage things that don't require services.

Alan Thomson – That is a 1978 thought process right there. I don't think it is appropriate anymore. What do the County Commissioners think about that?

Art Swannack – I don't know, Alan. I'm trying to figure out what it would be. Would an amphitheater be that? I'm trying to think about what might have been going on when I was in junior high when they wrote this. The gorge concept where you just have a big music party area out in the middle of agricultural land that doesn't have public services or utilities and it is all private?

Tom Handy – At least you would need electricity.

Art Swannack – But does utilities mean public utilities for everybody or is it utilities to that particular public facility that is not a public service facility?

Dave Gibney –What about a boat racing place?

Alan Thomson – That is within the city limit of St. John.

Tom Handy – They had the (inaudible) to accommodate it because the County wouldn't take it.

Alan Thomson – That's correct.

Tom Handy – So maybe that is why this statement doesn't work anymore.

Alan Thomson – I'm getting down to the word, "Public," again. These kind of facilities seem to me like they would be private. Like the amphitheater is public in a sense but it is a private amphitheater on private land. I think that word, "Public," is drawing confusion in here.

Todd Hall – Is that open to the public or publically owned?

Alan Thomson –Yes, I think it must be publically owned.

Art Swannack – I think they were talking the opposite. I think they were talking about facilities the public can use, not requiring public services. So it would be like, for example, your solid waste department is a facility the public use but in that case it is a public service.

Alan Thomson – If you eliminate the word, "Public," you get to the same understanding. Facilities that do not require.

Dave Gibney – For if for some reason you decided to do the facility there and you decided you didn't want to put it on the grid, you could generate sufficient electricity for the outfit by capping the methane off the garbage, why would you discourage that? Why would you discourage something that doesn't require services or utilities? There may be other reasons to discourage it but the fact that it may not have to be hooked up to electricity or water or sewer or not?

Tom Handy – I think if we can't define it, it probably shouldn't be there

Todd Hall – That’s fine, we can remove it.

Tom Handy – Policy PF 3.5 is already regulated by the FAA. There’s no reason the County should need to get into that.

Alan Thomson – Tom is right. Any cell tower that is proposed within two miles of the Pullman-Moscow Airport has to be approved by the FAA. There is a process for that and we put people through that process and the cell tower companies know about that too. We had one down tonight in that area just off of 270.

Dave Gibney – Does the same apply to the airport near Colfax or Tekoa or landing strips?

Alan Thomson – It is public airports. It is not private airports.

Tom Handy – Private landing strip would be different. Anything that is controlled by the FAA.

Alan Thomson – We do have a development regulation currently that talks about area around public airports.

Todd Hall – Maybe that is good enough and you don’t need an extra policy in here to state that.

Alan Thomson – I think you are right. I don’t think that 3.4 or 3.5 are necessary.

Todd Hall – Would you not want to protect private landings strips, especially anything used by the crop dusters?

Alan Thomson – You would, but do we want to regulate it? We’ve had to go through a conditional use permit if it was near a facility like that or near a house. It goes through the CUP process and at that point people might point out that this is hazardous.

Tom Handy – It seems redundant.

Art Swannack – Just as a side note? I went to the old plan and copied out what they defined public facilities as and pasted it in the chat. They are counting, “Transmission lines, highways, major transportation facilities, airports, reservoirs, water related projects and similar State or Federally initiated projects.” I don’t know if that clears it up or why it was written like this. It is covering more things than what we first thought.

Dave Gibney – Are there any of those that do not require public services or utilities?

Art Swannack – Well, major transmission lines, high voltage lines. I’m wondering if that came about after the Snake River Dam project and the flooding of the ground along those areas. But I don’t know.

Todd Hall – Okay, so I will remove 3.4 and 3.5. Seems like there is a consensus there.

Next page. **Goal PF-4 – Smaller local public facilities constructed to serve local energy needs should be located so as to minimize impacts on adjacent land uses, including agricultural and residential land use.**

Policy PF-4.1- *Design of public facilities near residential land use should incorporate measures to minimize visual, noise, light and traffic impacts.*

Policy PF-4.2 – *Facilities proposed next to agricultural croplands should incorporate measures to minimize impacts on farm access and practices.*

Policy PF-4.3 – *Site proposed for facilities should represent the best feasible location to minimize impacts on other land use, given constraints of land availability and costs.*

Next page. **Goal PF-5 – Encourage the maintenance and improvements of the existing and future telecommunication systems(s) to a level adequate to serve the needs of the County, including voice, video and data, and other present and future telecommunication facilities and services.**

Policy PF-5.1 – *Priority in planning decisions for improvements to telecommunication systems should be consistent with local plans and regulations, industry systems and standards, and State and Federal regulations, including but not limited to:*

- *FCC and WUTC regulations;*
- *Consumer services, residential, governmental, or businesses;*
- *Zoning Ordinance requirements for private and public lands; and*
- *Surrounding area and region’s demand*

Policy PF-5.2 – *Establish a service level standard adequate to meet the needs of Whitman County.*

Todd Hall – I don’t think this one was in the old plan but maybe this is something that if you want to include it or maybe this came from an idea, I can’t remember.

Tom Handy – This is going to be continuously changing. It will be market driven.

Alan Thomson – That looks like a lot of work. I’m not quite sure what that would mean.

Todd Hall – That was existing too, in the old plan.

Mark Storey - Establish a service level standard. What we should do, though is say that we would encourage land use practices that help providers by the highest level of service possible or something more like that.

Todd Hall – Both of these, the goal and the policies are in the existing plan.

Dave Gibney – Where in the plan? In 1978 you guys were just a few years past party lines.

Todd Hall – It is in the telecommunications element. It was last adopted or amended in 1999. A lot has changed in the cellular world since then. Then you’ve got these. So, basically this whole section, I’m looking at it right now. This whole section, this came up, too, I think, Mark, in an email for Alan, “Accommodate the underline, accommodation of utilities.” This whole section was a question mark.

Next page. **Policy PF-5.3** *Establish a classification and inventory system to make records available for all services provided.*

Tom Handy – Yes, 5.3. What does that mean?

Dave Gibney – That is GIS and public records and transparency

Tom Handy – But those weren't words back when this was written.

Todd Hall – So, basically every single one I am looking at now, they are in there. So I kept them there because I wasn't sure of the viability or the need to keep them or not at this point. That is another one to look at.

Art Swannack – One question that comes to mind is, some of the Federal funding is saying that you need to have a base level of service in your plan. I don't know if it needs to be in here. In order to be eligible for some of the broadband money or projects. They define that base level of service that everybody should have. Now it is way above what a lot of us have. But I'm wondering if you need a line like that in there just as a checkmark that is generic and then you can figure it out in your other stuff.

Tom Handy – I think something like what Mark said earlier about the highest level of service or whatever his language was, seemed to hit that mark.

Art Swannack – So, does 5.3 cover the road system stuff, too. Because Mark has to maintain all the maps and everything for roads and bridges.

Tom Handy – I think it could be adapted to the GIS stuff. This is kind of updating the wording on it. It reflects current technology.

Mark Storey – In 5.3 we are already required to do it for the road system each year, anyway.

Art Swannack – The utilities are required to have their pipelines. You guys get the information on that. The gas lines and all that type of thing going through the County. You could re-write that to the wordage that Tom is suggesting that basically says, all available information will be placed into the GIS system as we receive it to make certain that to give the public the information they need about what's out there. It could be written better than that. Just a thought.

Dave Gibney – It seems that this whole section could use a little modernization, refocus and repurpose. I don't have language to suggest right now.

Mark Storey – Why don't we ask Todd for other agencies rural counties like ours what kind of language they use in other locations that we could plagiarize just for a new set of policies and goals.

Todd Hall – Yes, we will take a closer look at this one and see what around the data and inventory like you said on the GIS, what could be used. It could be a much shorter section, for sure.

Tom Handy – I don't know that we have a radio telescope, either.

Todd Hall – Yes, you noticed that, too. It's pretty cool.

Mark Storey - Well, wishful thinking in 1978.

Art Swannack - There's none at WSU?

Dave Gibney – There are some dishes but not telescopes.

Alan Thomson – I like that thought that we need to revise this one by looking at what others have been doing in more recent updates to comp plans.

Policy PF-5.4 – *Review all development proposal in unincorporated area for potential impacts.*

- *The cost of correcting existing and potential significant negative impacts shall be borne by the applicant and/or owner.*
- *Construction standards may be imposed through Accommodation of Utilities on County Road Right-of-Way and Lands for Whitman County, the Whitman County Zoning Ordinance and other regulatory authority of local, state and federal agencies.*

Todd Hall – I worked on this section and this was the big question mark because that was a comment like, what is the accommodation of the utilities on county road right-of-way and lands? Is that something you guys use every day?

Mark Storey – We have a policy set up. I need to get you that information. I think I promised it to you a few weeks ago and I didn't produce. I might be at fault here, for not giving you better guidance.

Alan Thomson – Is that Mark off the mark, here?

Mark Storey – Mark was at the moment.

Policy PF-5.5 – *Develop and institute access control standards and requirements for all Whitman County telecommunications needs.*

- *Allow for future expansion and shared use of facilities.*
- *Require that design and construction does not preempt competitor's use*
- *Assure prompt response to rapidly changing industry and conditions.*

Tom Handy – I'm curious to that last slide. The access control standards and requirements. Is that who can play in our back yard or what does that mean?

Alan Thomson – The time machine in 1978 is trying to remember what they were thinking.

Tom Handy – A lot of these technologies were pretty new and developing at that time.

Alan Thomson – This needs to be modernized.

Todd Hall – We will take a closer look. That's all I had to go over tonight so, do you guys have any other comments or questions?

We will take a good scrub at this one and look at the other ones or remove the PF-3.4 and PF-3.5. Sounds like we will remove the word, "Public," from the section to avoid confusion. These are all public facilities as mentioned in the element because it is not just public.

Dave Gibney – You might find a better title. Look around in other comp plans.

Art Swannack – I was just glancing at Lewis County’s comp plan. They list schools and all sorts of other things under their public facility section. I don’t know what should be in here. I just glanced at it and they have stuff in there we haven’t even talked about.

Tom Handy – We don’t allow schools in unincorporated areas.

Alan Thomson – We don’t allow schools as part of the development regulations in the unincorporated areas.

Mark Storey – We only have one school right now. Steptoe is the only one in an unincorporated area.

Alan Thomson – Yes, and that is an RCR or RCC1 or 2 designation, not the agricultural district.

Art Swannack – Up in Spokane County you’ve got Liberty School District that is out in the middle of nowhere. Do they have something special in Spokane County that allows that? I’m not saying we have a need for that right now, I’m just wondering if Pullman needed more space for a school and they started going outside of town rather than in town. How would we handle it?

Alan Thomson – If it were Pullman trying to do that, they would have to annex it because we don’t allow that by regulations right now. Water and sewer would be the major issue. That’s why we don’t have big developments in the County. Water and sewer.

Tom Handy – Would that be the same for a day care, too, Alan?

Alan Thomson – Yes, we are held to 5,000 gallons a day. That is the only way you can get water for any facility, any house, building whatever.

Art Swannack – You could operate a pretty good size building on 5,000 gallons a day if you’re doing a day care or something else. Based on what Malden is talking to DOE about, you could end up with some type of a, what did they call that, Tom, for a treatment facility?

Tom Handy – A large scale on-site septic system.

Mark Storey – Just for comparison, the Pullman Toyota Dealership in the Pullman-Moscow Corridor runs off of 5,000 gallons a day. They step up right next to it quite often but that gives you a sense how big of a facility 5,000 gallons will get you if you run efficient systems. You recycle your wash water is what you do.

Alan Thomson – In the Corridor District we allow lots of different types of facilities in the North and South Pullman-Moscow Corridor District. It is all subject to exempt wells. We’ve even got medical buildings and restaurants allowed in the Corridor District. But you know, 5,000 gallons a day is your limit, supposedly, and there is no meter on those wells, so we don’t know.

Tom Handy – The only reason I brought up a Day Care is when you said those schools are allowed in the unincorporated areas, if there were a day care type Montessori School or something like that, it could

conceivably be located in the County and use less than 5,000 gallons of water a day on a residential style well.

Alan Thomson – We would have to include that in our development regulations, because right now, it's not there. I think the comp plan language that we are working on right now could accommodate that but we would have to add that into the development regulations. We did that with churches. We added that in, too.

Dave Gibney – You've been encouraging us to expand the allowable uses in the Ag zone as part of this.

Alan Thomson – Through this conversation we can amend the development regulations if the BOCC is on board with it.

Art Swannack – We don't even need to go down that road in this conversation right now. We are looking at what does the comp plan allow more than what should the regulations be as to how we actually operate. You talked about the proposal to do the multifamily housing and what used to be the Hawkins property. Has that been covered in the comp plan yet as something that is allowed, or is it already in our current plan allowed if a person wrote a code for it?

Alan Thomson – It is not spoken about in our current code, no. So, that would be an amendment to the current comp plan or it needs to be the new comp plan and then a whole new development regulation for such a project needs to be generated.

Art Swannack – That one has the water to do something out there to operate on an exempt well.

Alan Thomson – Just an FYI the Druffels are talking to me about potential projects there. It is on their radar. They know what they would have to do in order for something like that to come along but they are trying to get somebody interested to come in there and develop that area.

Dave Gibney – It would be nice if we can come up with a comp plan here so we can say appropriate things like that are consistent with it.

Alan Thomson – I think that is what needs to be done too if the BOCC is up to it.

Art Swannack – We talked about it some before Tom got on board and we really haven't had a chance to talk with COVID. That is a conversation that we should have, Alan.

Alan Thomson – I agree.

Todd Hall – The next meeting we have scheduled, speaking of land uses in June 30th meeting in two weeks, is that section as well as the environmental. We talked about combining conversations with Alan and Mark and the Agricultural conservation and natural resources. That will be lumped into the land use section. So, those are the ones that will be reviewed.

Matt Covert will be leading that discussion. I will be on line as an advisor but I'm going to let him take the lead since he was the main drafter of that. We look forward to going over that and in the meantime I'll take a closer look at the Services chapter and the Facilities chapter and take a closer look at some of your

neighbors and see how we can shorten that section up a little better and modernize it and then we will chat with you, Alan, and Mark, and see how we are looking.

Alan Thomson – That’s good, Todd. Thanks. That’s it unless anybody has any other questions.

Mark Storey – The only think I would add is what we always add if you get to thinking about this and have some ideas of what we should have talked about, send comments to Alan, Todd, or I and just keep us in the loop with the after thoughts. This is not the end of the discussion. It is just the middle.

Todd Hall – Thank you everybody.

Art Swannack – Mark and Alan, could we have the conversation about the multifamily housing prior to the next meeting or after it in terms of like a workshop discussion?

Alan Thomson – I think beforehand. I’m just curious about what the BOCC is thinking and yes, I think that is a conversation we should have.

Mark Storey – That is what I was thinking. Just in workshop next week or the following week we have a conversation without a vote or anything of the sort but just to find out what the three of you are thinking. It doesn’t help us to waste our time doing something you guys don’t agree with.

Art Swannack – You probably better give us a briefing on the situation, Alan, so we can talk about it intelligently at that briefing, too. Can you set that up with Maribeth?

Mark Storey – Alan and I will get together and get that set up.

Alan Thomson – I’m not going to be here tomorrow.

Mark Storey – That is three demerits. Apparently, I’m going to figure it out tomorrow.

Art Swannack – I’ll be down there tomorrow if you want to see me.

Mark Storey – The only question is do you want it as a separate workshop or just part of your regular workshop?

Art Swannack – Let’s just set some time aside in our normal workshop time for it. So, just ask Maribeth to partition.

Mark Storey – That’s easier. Okay, I can do that tomorrow.

Alan Thomson – Thank you all.

7:12 p.m. – Closed.

