

GMVUAC May 1, 2017

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Called to order – 7:00 pm

Members Present:

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Steve Hiester | Hank Haynes |
| Peter Rimbos | Warren Iverson |
| Rhys Sterling | Adam Sterling |
| Linda Harer | Lorraine Blacklock |
| Stephen Deutschman | Susan Harvey (late, proxy to Peter until arrival) |

Members Absent:

Sue Neuner (proxy to Steve)

Agenda:

Rhys moved to approve agenda, Lorraine seconded.

Motion passed

April Meeting Minutes:

Deferred to next month.

Public Comment Period: - 7:07 pm

Resident: Heard that the state legislature is considering making Seattle a separate county?

Lorraine: The move is afoot, some people are trying to make Seattle its own county with Bellevue as the county seat.

Peter: We've not heard anything about this.

Guest Speaker:

King County Proposed Farm Initiative Legislation
Erin Auzins, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)
Randy Sandin, Dept. of Permitting and Environmental Review (DPER)

Erin: Randy Sandin from DPER will handle the presentation, Allen Painter is also here to answer questions.

Randy: I am the resource product manager. Over the past years, the county developed land use policies based on protecting land and supporting agriculture, and added new policies in 2016 supporting the local food industry. Part of comprehensive plan update is to look at how well the zoning code, etc. align with land use policies. The last major update to the zoning code was in 1993, and DPER regularly updates code as policies change, although the structure of the code has not changed. When the code was written, land uses were put into 8 categories including recreation, retail, etc., and resource land uses including resource mining. Agriculture was narrowly defined to only include growing crops and raising livestock, but not other things that usually occur on farms. Farm-product sales was in retail, slaughterhouse was in the manufacturing table, ranch-hand housing was separate, etc. That structure was not responsive to changes in agriculture, categories were based upon a system established by the government in the '80s, changes in tech from last 30 years are not reflected in table. In 2013 we amended shoreline regulations to comply with state laws, lined all designations up to zoning codes, and all activities in the resource zoning-use table were allowed in the resource shoreline designation, but manufacturing was not. For example, no creamery being allowed on a farm in that area is a structural problem with the code. All agricultural activities are allowed only if part of an existing farm for associated agricultural uses, the zoning code did not allow other uses for non-tillable lands in a farm.

Rewriting the code was a rigorous process. Previously up to 2,000 square feet of retail area allowed but can increase to 3,500, and if someone had a 2,400-foot storage building and wanted to convert it for use in sales, they would have needed to partition off 400 feet or get special use permit. The comprehensive plan rewrite focused on 3 areas: (1) redefining agriculture, which is now broadly defined as the commercial use of land for the production of food, livestock, or both; (2) agricultural activities now include everything generally found on a farm, pretty much in line with state definitions and other counties; (3) created a new definition for agricultural support services, which are activities that occur on land not primarily for crop/livestock production. We also moved everything into the resource land use table to eliminate conflicts between land use and shoreline regulations, added the concept of agricultural support services with limits on where they can be located and how large. We added a new process somewhere between being permitted outright and a conditional use permit, the agricultural tech review committee will screen proposals wanting to deviate from standards for retail areas, etc., intended to screen simple decisions out of more complex processes, included ability to locate structures closer to Agricultural Production Districts (APD), in response to issues brought up in the Snoqualmie valley floodplain, it allows other usages provided they meet conditions established in the code, 1/10 the cost of a conditional use permit.

We collaborated with the agricultural commission, Dept. of Natural Resources, etc., over a 6-month period, submitted proposals as part of the comprehensive

plan in 2016, but things were complex so it was delayed to this year. We resumed work in January, now presenting it to the public, and the goal is to have it back to the council in September.

Peter: Clarification question, the comments we sent in for the comprehensive plan were based on surveys of constituents, one concern is urban facilities located in rural areas. Farms could be stretched to encompass large manufacturing facilities which belong under industrial zoning. How can we feel more comfortable that guideposts will protect rural areas?

Randy: One requirement is compatibility, what they do must support the APD. This is not intended to create facilities that import products for processing. Another criterion is to attempt to contract from local farmers to support the business, and there are also scale and compatibility requirements. If they would consume tillable soils to create, it would not be allowed, as this is not intended to be in conflict with the APD.

Peter: But what if it was located in a RA5 zone?

Randy: Lots where uses are allowed outright are within 600 feet from an APD and have direct access. If one is wanting to site agricultural support elsewhere, they would need to meet conditions in the zoning code, primarily compatibility and ability to contain impacts.

Hank: What about a marijuana processing facility? Could the import products?

Randy: Industrial zone properties are not included, nor are all RA zones or CB (Commercial Business) and NB (Neighborhood Business) outside the UGA (Urban Growth Area), so we are not talking about marijuana.

Steve: Could you give us some examples?

Randy: In the lower Snoqualmie APD there has been a demand for farm worker housing, but restrictions on building residences currently limit houses to one per lot. Property immediately adjacent to the APD could support housing, and that's what we envision. Usually lots within 600 feet and adjacent to an APD, Snoqualmie is particularly impacted due to floodway designations, and that opportunity does not exist in the current code.

Warren: Are there any APDs in the Maple Valley area?

Randy: No, there are in Enumclaw.

Peter: So this doesn't affect us, no conflicts?

Randy: Stuff done in areas adjacent to APDs would not affect Maple Valley.

Steve: Are there any size restrictions? What about for housing?

Randy: Yes, same as what is allowed on a farm.

Erin: On property greater than 1,000 square feet you would get one more unit.

Randy: Conditions attached are similar to what we would do for conditional use permits, just wanted to eliminate the time and costs associated. The agricultural community's profit margins are not great, and permit fees are prohibitive.

Peter: Trying to streamline the process. This is not going to increase the need for more code enforcement? Hopefully just cheaper and quicker, because DPER is short on code enforcers.

Randy: Yes, we are always competing for general expense funds, so it's a tradeoff.

Warren: When will this be submitted?

Randy: In September. We are hoping to have outreach done in June, and final changes in July to be ready for review. All agricultural zones are A10 or A35, and there are no designations less than that.

Steve: RA5 is basically single family.

Peter: How does John Taylor from KC Dept of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP) fit into this?

John Taylor: Lots of people looked at unintended consequences, worked through this rigorously, doing their best to think of things first. My department was involved in drafting, the agricultural commission strongly supports these changes, and I'm here to answer any questions about more specific farms.

Rhys: Most people live in RA zones, but many people have small farms/horses, will anything impact/benefit/detract from RA uses?

Randy: This will not affect farm activities occurring on rural properties. People have taken advantage of agriculture, and we have not clearly made a distinction. We have subsidized agriculture permit fees in response to farming communities, so some people on rural lots claim to be doing agriculture to get reduced rates, claiming that their garage is a goat storage facility. We want to communicate to the public what agriculture is, where these programs will benefit, etc. This ordinance will have no effect on what can be done on residential property.

Steve: If someone has property next to a farm that's in an RA zone, whoever owns the farm doesn't need to own the adjacent piece of property? If it's next to the APD, can it be leased?

Randy: Could do that as a private venture, would need contracts/letters of intent from farmers that would actually use any facility, it cannot be purely speculative.

Peter: Are forest production districts not involved?

Randy: This is regarding the resource land-use table, so residential accessory uses are allowed, but not in other tables such as forests. We have been discussing with forest actors, it's not as complicated as this issue, but we still need to look at defining accessory uses.

Peter: I would like to request that a draft land-use table be sent to me.

Warren: What about accessory dwelling units in residential lots?

Randy: There are size limits, must be under 1,000 square feet, owner must live on the property, but can upsize through the transfer of development rights (TDR) to increase the square footage of one unit.

Rhys: Regarding Reserve Silica, did the April 24 meeting go well?

Randy: We had couple of meetings, will meet again tomorrow, the last meeting included Holcim who is the party responsible for the fill site. I will know more tomorrow, but we are shooting for June 5.

Council Business: -

PSRC Draft Regional Economic Strategy: Hank Haynes

Peter: Regarding the schedule, I called the PSRC this morning and spoke to Ruth Wezeman about their regional economic strategy (RES). It looks like they will be having meetings this Wednesday and on the 17th, but the public comment period ends on May 14th, leaving only 3 days to adopt by the 17th. Ruth said the process works by getting comments from the time of release and then make changes continually, so they're trying to wrap up by then. It's surprising when compared to the comprehensive plan, but because of that I would recommend trying to get something in as soon as possible. Tonight the Economic Development Committee will discuss and ask for a vote of approval for what can/cannot be sent, and we will try to get it done quickly. I already sent out a draft cover letter, want to fill in the blanks with something about how the rural area is reflected in the plan, then we need to decide what level of comments to submit. Hank will describe our comments, he's done most of the comments and two revisions. We will decide tonight what we want to submit. Hank has wordsmithing comments that are not terribly critical, but also insertions of entire pages, although not enough time to discuss everything. We just need to approve what flavor, and I will edit and get it down to a reasonable size, but need guidance on what is to be done.

Steve: Read the document through once, it's 63 pages of high-level strategy/plans, not a lot of nuts and bolts, so the cover letter can be similar. No need to go over details/wordsmith, but here are 5/6 things to highlight, such as environmental responsibility, broadening the definition of education opportunities, the definition of opportunities for veterans/disabilities, etc.

Hank: I'm more concerned with what isn't there, as there's no mention of Puget Sound fisheries or salmon.

Steve: Fish issues are included under environmental.

Hank: Another concern is the heavy focus on air/water transportation, interconnecting road systems for urban areas, and the fact that rural areas are an afterthought.

Peter: Anything about road corridors is taken from Vision 2040.

Hank: We need to figure out how to keep it amazing for us, pages 34-36 is rural area. I produced a draft C, Peter updated, and would like approval on the fundamental principles.

Steve: It's difficult to go through 60+ pages of revised comments before the due date.

Hank: Different chapters networked in terms of productivity/market, need to coordinate by putting ideas in those chapters, will need 4-6 months more.

Peter: I read everything several times, there are 5 sections in the document, I recommend ignoring 3/4/5 as those are background data. There are 62 pages in sections 1/2, and only 2-3 pages strictly on rural areas. In the draft cover letter I wanted to emphasize points that concern us on the rural areas. For the rest of it, we should vote tonight to allow the Economic Committee and Peter to review the

wordsmithing and major comments to reduce repetition and still make points. I can get Hank's comments down to 10% of what they are now.

Steve: A lot of the comments could be turned into a general statement, it would be easier to review.

Hank: But it would be difficult for someone to take that general statement and put it back into the pages.

Peter: There are no subsection numbers like in the comprehensive plan, it's based on page numbers so it's difficult to send comments.

Steve: There are five areas, each has a set of strategies and what needs to be done.

Rhys: As far as the rest of the council is concerned, we would prefer authorizing the committee to do their thing and submit. Just do it.

Hank: If we don't get it in, we've lost our chance.

Steve: What about the form?

Peter: Would like to request authority to do final editing.

Lorraine moved to authorize Peter to perform the final editing, Hank seconded.

Motion passed

Hank moved to allow the Economic Committee to come up with comments/finish putting the document together, Lorraine seconded.

Motion passed

Peter: I also need approval on the cover letter for once it's amended with comments on the rural area.

Lorraine moved to approve the cover letter, Rhys seconded.

Motion passed

Peter: The PSRC economic development board is having two meetings, with the first on this Wednesday. Hank volunteered to speak for the area council or as a private citizen. Nothing will likely be finished by then.

Lorraine: Hank should speak as a private citizen if nothing else will be ready.

Rhys: He could read your cover letter into the record.

Peter: For Wednesday, I suggest completing the cover letter by adding comments on rural section, and I can see Hank hand-delivering and reading out the letter, then say that further detailed comments will follow. Nothing else.

Rhys: Come up with a statement for Hank to read.

Peter: You can separately make comments.

Hank: I will not make statements as individual citizens, as I can send those in a letter.

Peter: (as Lisa Chase is leaving) What happened with the marijuana permit?

Lisa Chase: The permit got approved, we are gearing up to do an appeal, and we have a Go Fund Me campaign. (gf.me/u/2zdn) It should come up if you look for "stop industrial pot growing in MV."

Hank: Does it have to be annexed to the Covington water dist?

Lisa Chase: It's not big enough, they need to do something with the pipes. It's an RA5 area with a 20,000 square foot marijuana manufacturing center on SE 240th. The commercial site development permit got approval, we will be doing a Land-Use Petition Action (LUPA) appeal, and we already have money raised.

Warren: Will there be an article in the Voice of the Valley or Covington Reporter?

Lisa Chase: Met with Cathleen, will be calling people for opinions and write an article. Haven't contacted the Covington Reporter.

Peter: Have you contacted DPER about widening roads? Will they do a second mitigated determination of non-significance (MDNS)? Do you need all MDNS's available to appeal?

Lisa Chase: They just said they will make the trucks smaller.

Rhys: Just appeal, you can amend later, and let your attorneys do their work. There's a short time frame.

Peter: Are your lawyers confident?

Lisa Chase: One has done a LUPA appeal before, there was a lot-line adjustment done after purchase on the land, claiming to be an innocent purchaser but the sister was in real estate. There are several things wrong, including the road, but DPER picked the site and got it vested.

Hank: Nothing in the PSRC RES about the marijuana industry.

Linda: Promote the heck out of the appeal.

(Susan arrives)

Hank: (Returning to council business) So what can I say at the PSRC meeting?

Peter: You will be given the cover letter, then you can say that we will be submitting detailed comments soon.

Steve: You must read the statement verbatim.

Peter: We don't want you answering statements because we're not ready yet.

Hank: What if I get asked questions? There's no other representatives from rural areas.

Rhys moved that Peter creates a script for Hank to read verbatim at the PSRC meeting, Lorraine seconded.

Motion passed

Bylaws changes: Rhys Sterling

Rhys: I emailed the proposed bylaw changes to everyone, tonight's meeting will be the first reading, then we can vote and make changes for a revised proposal, then vote

in the June meeting to adopt/reject. Does anyone have any specific comments? I will not read it word by word.

Susan: What about the involuntary servitude clause? If there's not enough people on a committee then you can enlist others to join, can there be a time limit? Or allow someone to join for a few months? Otherwise people will feel trapped.

Peter: Somewhere it says committees need a minimum of 3 members, if only 2 people volunteer, no committee is formed.

Lorraine: Can always reform it if something comes up.

Peter: Don't remember ever having anyone forced to be on a committee.

Susan: People might feel overwhelmed and quit.

Rhys: If there is significant interest to revive later on we can.

Peter: Or just create a focal point until there's enough interest to form a committee.

Rhys: I will come up with some language.

Peter: Regarding community areas, we have difficulty finding Ravensdale people, how are the bylaws stated now?

Rhys: How would you like them to be?

Peter: If we need to put someone there to maintain enough people we should be able to, even if not from that area. It's in 3(c)(1).

Rhys: I will continue to look for that. Stephen, did we take care of the proxy issue?

Warren: We should consider the first Monday in April a holiday (NCAA basketball championships), need up to 5 proxies?

Peter: The bylaws say we shall only consider candidates from the area of a vacant position, but if none exist, shall allow candidates from other areas. Sec. F 4(d)(e). It sounds like everyone thinks this is OK, the flexibility is there. One more comment, Susan pointed out that the Vice-Chair is also the PR chair?

Rhys: I've striked that out, now anyone can be the chair. It was a carryover from when the Vice-Chair had election responsibility, but it no longer makes sense.

Peter: Will the PR Committee vote for a new chair?

Rhys: We will consider, it's just no longer mandatory.

Susan: What about the election committee? The Vice-Chair's only job now is just to take over Chair's position if absent?

Rhys: The PR Committee still has election responsibilities, but not Vice-Chair. Should the PR chair have certain responsibilities?

Steve: Just wanted to know who the responsible party is.

Peter: The PR Committee can decide how to divvy up responsibilities.

Rhys: Any other comments? Please email me. This is a work in progress, not cast in stone. I will get an updated version out in advance of the June 5th meeting.

Website Update: Linda

Linda: Drove down to Olympia and met with Lief, our website designer. We went over format, but one important thing that the council needs to make a decision on is that our current provider Network Solutions has a low rating, we could be paying

less, they use older technology, and we should make a change if possible.
Currently paying \$18 for the website, it's over capacity but under functioning.
Hank: Wanted to keep old site in the background while testing out the new system.
Linda: I'm talking about the provider, can change easily with the old site. Network Solutions does not work well with Word Press. Only way to keep both is if we had two different domain names, cannot have same site operating on two different hosts.
Peter: We have the existing website, what will we do with the old site if we switch over to the new site.
Linda: Can move the existing site, just want off the host as soon as possible. Not developing anything right now.
Peter: All you're asking is can we go from brand x to brand y?
Linda: What we're paying now is \$18/month, and Network Solutions is an antique. One service is at \$4.99/month and with greater capacity, that service would increase to \$9.99 after the first year. That can capture emails, run surveys, can be interactive and have a blog. They'll do a fantastic job.
Peter: Just want to make sure we have a website working until the new site is ready.
Linda: How long is Network Solutions paid for?
Steve: Until next year.
Hank: Will we need new domain name if we switch?
Linda: Network Solutions does not own our domain name, but it can only live with one host.
Peter: The new site will need maintenance, would like to keep old site working for as long as needed until we switch over.
Linda: It's not going to be that complicated, mostly plug and play. We've already spent money on Network Solutions, we can do the best that we can on Network Solutions for now.
Warren: Do as best as you can on Network Solutions.
Peter: Can you move the site to a new host?
Steve: Move to a new host, keep the old site, then develop new site separately.
Linda: New site will take the place of our old site, and it will be developed behind the scenes, just not accessible.
Warren: When will this occur?
Linda: Shooting for 60-90 days.
Steve: I pay for Network Solutions and get reimbursed.
Linda: I have no problem with paying for the site and getting reimbursed.
Warren: If it should be 60-90 days, we've already paid for network solution.
Linda: We actually would need to switch providers first, then develop there.
(More discussion)

Lorraine moved to change host to 1-and-1 web hosting, Rhys seconded.

Motion passed

Hank abstains

Linda: Peter, could you find the service area map in your emails? The high resolution one.

Peter: Tom created those maps. Could always call him up?

Susan: Will you have to make more trips down to Olympia?

Linda: Yes.

Peter: Will you need to tell Treesa what you're doing? She doesn't care about changing hosts?

Linda: Once we get to the flip point, then we will.

Peter: How much are we paying Leif, and how?

Linda: We have a \$500 budget, anything over that I'm donating.

Peter: At a minimum, we owe Leif \$500.

Linda: Yes, he sent us an invoice.

Steve: I think it sets a bad precedent if you're spending your own money on council business.

Rhys: We will have a suitable certificate of appreciation for Linda. Just keep us posted.

Linda: I kept all the notes from before, it's much easier to plug and play.

Peter: We will discuss later regarding emails, what to do with updates, etc.

Rhys: The Executive Committee can get together to discuss Steve's concerns.

Committee Reports: -

Transportation: Susan Harvey

Susan: Warren, have the speed signs gone up in Hobart?

Warren: They are due in May, got the two sites, we are making sure it would be able to record the speed of cars going by instead of just flashing "slow down."

Lorraine: Will it have flashing lights? Some signs have red and blue lights that look like police. It just informs drivers that they would have gotten a ticket if a cop was there, in Tacoma.

Economic: Hank Haynes

Hank: We had meeting on the 27th, environment and growth is heavily underscored in the PSRC RES draft, it is important that we view this document. Thank you for the support.

Peter: That's all in the cover letter

Growth Management: Peter Rimbo

Peter: I emailed everyone earlier to show any new activity on tasks, the only change was the I heard from Lisa, DPER approved the marijuana permit. There will be a LUPA appeal, certain conditions having to do with the size/number of vehicles on the road, and DPER will do a separate MDNS on that condition. The concern is that I am unsure how it will be enforced except by neighbor complaints, and they

will be calling every day. Randy admitted that there is little code enforcement, so I expect there to be problems.

Public Relations: Rhys Sterling

Susan: Just a comment, but did you see Reagan Dunn's survey? It was sent out via mail and online, it has pertinent issues, etc. Just wanted to say that they are well done, and wanted PR committee to have one for reference.

Steve: Should follow up on how many people responded, could ask Marissa?

Rhys: The town hall is on Monday, the Hobart church sponsors meals every Monday, and they will do a BBQ for the meeting on May 15. Food is at 5:00, dedication of the new playground is after food at 6:30, then the CSA town hall is at 7:00.

Environmental: Rhys Sterling

Susan: Did you discuss Reserve Silica?

Rhys: I asked Randy about it, but I don't know what's going on, sent out invites and heard back from Tom Buroker, etc. The Dept. of Ecology will be asking Reserve Silica consultants for updates, but I would prefer that they do not come. I also sent invites to Allen, DPER, and the Dept. of Ecology.

Marissa: Allen will not be here that night.

Rhys: The meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 5 for agencies to give a presentation on Reserve Silica, cleanup, etc.

Susan: Have they indicated that they invited Reserve Silica? It's not a good idea due to antagonism, etc. Should advise them not to.

Lorraine: Having just the agencies would be best.

Rhys: I'll let Tom know.

Peter: Question for the PR Committee, should we draft a plan for getting new members? Some people came tonight, I am putting news blasts out to people, and we need more of that. Part of that process will be taken care of once the new website is up.

Rhys: We are looking for suggestions.

Hank: Google searches, we need to make sure key search terms are available to make sure people hit us.

Linda: I know a search engine optimization specialist, I will work on that.

Rhys: Do we have extra stuff to hand out at the town hall?

Linda: Once we get more people on our website, we can easily attract new members.

Also, Peter has done a fantastic job on the Voice of the Valley write-ups using our new letterhead.

Peter: For the CSA meeting, are there specific things we want to discuss with Reagan Dunn, sheriff, and department heads there?

Lorraine: Need to ask about the second MDNS for 200th? Should make it public.

Peter: I will ask if John Starbard is there.

Rhys: Should at least ask why, since it doesn't make any sense.

Hank: What about home security with rising drug use?

Steve: On the news I saw that King County (KC) has the highest property taxes in the country but we still cannot fix roads.

Warren: The septic tank bill died in Olympia, Linn Schneider announced every septic tank must be monitored every year, companies will do it for \$100, later revised that it only applies to pressure distribution systems.

Peter: There's usually somebody from public health at these meetings.

Warren: I also heard there's a permit needed for pumping septic tanks, but I'm unsure. Third, the legislature needs to come up with an answer to the Hirst decision, the Washington Administrative Code says wells are exempt, KC has started a 18-month study, but not doing anything yet because they're waiting for the legislature.

Peter: If you ask KC, they'll just say they're waiting.

Warren: One proposal is to lower taxes in exchange for putting in a well.

Susan: What about onsite septic systems, will there be no new fees?

Warren: This seems like a backdoor to get around all the backlash from fees.

Peter: Should ask these questions at the town hall.

Warren moved to adjourn, Rhys seconded.

Motion passed

Meeting Adjourned – 9:20 pm